DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 291 729 SP 029 992

AUTHOR Martin, David S., Ed.
TITLE The Professional Imperative: Educational Excellence for All. Selected Papers from the 1987 Annual Meeting of the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education.
INSTITUTION American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, Washington, D.C.
REPORT NO ISBN-0-8403-4654-9
PUB DATE 88
NOTE 110p.
AVAILABLE FROM Kendall/Hunt Publishing Co., 2460 Kerper Blvd., P.O. Box 539, Dubuque, IA 52001 ($16.00).
PUB TYPE Speeches/Conference Papers (150) -- Reports - Descriptive (141)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC05 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Beginning Teachers; *Educational Change; *Educational Objectives; Educational Trends; Elementary Secondary Education; Equal Education; Higher Education; High Risk Students; Preservice Teacher Education; School Role; *Schools of Education

ABSTRACT

This volume contains selected papers from the 1987 Annual Meeting of the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education that was devoted to the essential theme "Educational Excellence for All." In various ways, each of these papers from that conference addresses this theme in a significant way. The following papers are included: (1) "Education in the Year 2000: 28th Charles W. Hunt Lecture" (Ernest W. Boyer); (2) "The Mission of Colleges of Education" (Bill Clinton); (3) "Teacher Induction: A Solvable Problem" (Kevin Ryan); (4) "Assessment for Teaching: An Initiative for the Profession" (Lee Shulman); (5) "The Role of Schools in Helping Children at Risk" (Marian Wright-Edelman); (6) "Educational Equity: What Does the Future Hold?" (Asa G. Hilliard, III); (7) "Education and the American Society: Can We Realize the Dream?" (Mary Hatwood Futrell); (8) "Building a Community of Common Interest" (William E. Gardner); and (9) "Future Imperatives: Education, Excellence, Equity" (Norene F. Daly). (JD)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED291729

Selected Papers From the 1987 Annual Meeting of the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

L. Smith

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

SP 029 992

Selected Papers from the 1987 Annual Meeting of the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education

The Professional Imperative: Educational Excellence for All

Volume Editor
David S. Martin

American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education
One Dupont Circle; Suite 610
Washington, D.C. 20036
(202) 293-2450

Kendall/Hunt
Publishing Company
Dubuque, Iowa

Copyright © 1988 American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education

Library of Congress Number: 87–83336

ISBN 0–8403–4654–9

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted, in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording, or otherwise, without the prior written permission of the copyright owner.

Printed in the United States of America
10 9 8 7 6 5 4 3 2 1

CONTENTS

	Page
Introduction – David S. Martin, Dean, School of Education and Human Services, Gallaudet University	v
Education in the Year 2000: 28th Charles W. Hunt Lecture – Ernest W. Boyer, President, Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching	1
The Mission of Colleges of Education – Bill Clinton, Governor of Arkansas	13
Teacher Induction: A Solvable Problem – Kevin Ryan, Professor of Education, Boston University	21
Assessment for Teaching: An Initiative for the Profession – Lee Shulman, Professor of Education, Stanford University	33
The Role of Schools in Helping Children at Risk – Marian Wright-Edelman, President, Children's Defense Fund	49
Educational Equity: What Does the Future Hold? – Asa G. Hilliard, III, Callaway Professor of Urban Education, Georgia State University	61

Education and the American Society: Can We Realize the Dream?
– Mary Hatwood Futrell, President, National Education Association 77

Building a Community of Common Interest
– William E. Gardner, Dean, College of Education, University of Minnesota, and President of AACTE, 1987–88 87

Future Imperatives: Education, Excellence, Equity
– Norene F. Daly, Dean, Florida Atlantic University, and President of AACTE, 1986–87 95

INTRODUCTION

Charles Willie, Harvard Professor of Education and Urban Studies, has a view of the dilemma of excellence and equity which fits well with the theme of the conference from which these chapters were drawn. Speaking to that problem in relation to data gathered from a study of the Harvard Undergraduate population, he focused his remarks recently on the question of maintaining diversification while at the same time maintaining excellence in the student body. He defined *excellence* as the "property of an individual," while defining *equity* as a "method of distribution of educational resources and opportunities in a manner that is fair." Thus, for him, equity becomes a property of groups, organizations, and institutions, and both individual and group properties must complement one another. The same juxtaposition of these concepts applies well to teacher education in our world today. We are concerned with equity and excellence not only in the children that our future teachers will educate, but also in the corpus of teachers and future teachers themselves.

This volume contains the proceedings of the 1987 Annual Meeting of the American Association of Colleges of Teacher Education (AACTE), which was devoted to the essential theme *Educational Excellence for All.* In various ways, each of these papers from that conference addresses this theme in a significant way,that pushes our awareness and resolve still higher to achieve that goal.

The Hunt Lecture, provided by Ernest Boyer, underscored the drastically changing nature of the American school population; without question, the teacher trained in the 1950's and 1960's will face culture shock in a classroom of the 1990's. Yet, Boyer focuses our attention succinctly on four

predictions for the future of education and teacher education – predictions that we would do well to heed.

Lee Shulman of Stanford, on the other hand, points us clearly at the imperative of focusing on the knowledge base of the teaching profession – a base which has existed without real recognition for many years. In addition, the important work of his Stanford project on the development of both new and diverse methods of assessing quality in teacher education graduates for the National Certification process, shows great promise for not only establishing a more systematic method of evaluating quality across the States, but also a more fair approach because of its multiple-criteria. In the past, too much of the quality of a new teacher's performance has gone unrecognized because of the narrowness of assessment methods which were limited to paper-and-pencil measures in a multiple-choice format.

Both Asa Hilliard and Marian Wright-Edelman underscore more specifically the nature of the changing American school population and not only provide us with support for Boyer's earlier warnings, but also provide us with criteria and concepts from sociology. Their presentations are excellent examples of the benefit to the teacher education profession from a solid grounding in the social sciences – disciplines which have much to tell us about how we should shape the teacher education enterprise. After all, schooling must not and cannot happen in isolation from, but rather in connection with, the rest of society. Even if one is a social reconstructionist – seeing education as a tool for changing or reforming the society as many of us are – that activity cannot proceed without a clear conception of what the society is now and of the historical roots of its present state. Their calls for active attention now to the fundamental inequalities of the American educational system and in general society are critically important for all teacher educators as a specific analysis of the excellence-quality problem today.

Kevin Ryan provides our profession at this time with a strong case for systematic methods of induction of the new teacher – ideas which are already very valuable to our institutions because of the new NCATE expectation of follow-up assistance to graduates for all teacher education programs. His lucid explanation of the nature of "mentoring," for example, provides us with a sense of direction for at least one approach to systematic induction for the new teacher.

William Gardner calls for our immediate attention to the knowledge base of teacher education; in so doing, he gives us a plan for implementation of Shulman's seminal work. His demand for finding "common ground" for teacher educators would be wise for us to heed in carrying forward the important AACTE agenda which he details for us.

Finally, both Mary Hatwood Futrell and Norene Daly in different ways clarify how the society at large and the federal government in particular can inhibit or enhance the efforts of teacher educators and teachers to fundamentally change education in badly needed directions. Their well-aimed criticisms of the policies of the current federal administration and the philosophy behind those policies clearly indicate how the milieu in which we must operate will not be facilitative in at least the immediate future. Both Futrell and Daly have thrown down the gauntlet to us to stand together in this time of challenge and to allow no retreat from either equity or excellence.

Another look at the problem of excellence and equity in education indicates that we have at least a double-edged problem. On the one hand, we must draw upon a more diverse population for our future teachers to meet the needs of a more diverse student population, while on the other hand, we must somehow build a greater respect for the teaching profession from that society in order to make teaching attractive to the most talented from that population. We continue to have much dialogue within the profession about the first aspect of that problem. We have already made proper pronouncements about the importance of raising and keeping high standards for admission into teacher education programs, and we are finally beginning to understand the importance of variable time length for the future teacher to complete the teacher education programs. If we as educators are honest about satisfying individual differences, we must apply the same thinking to teachers in training—we must work with future teachers who have excellent potential but who perhaps need additional time for mastery in order to achieve that potential and provide them with every opportunity (even if it means more than the usual number of years) to achieve that potential. However, the second aspect of the problem—making teaching attractive for the "best and brightest"—we have perhaps perceived as beyond our direct control, although we do make public pronouncements supporting higher salaries and better working conditions for teachers.

Nonetheless, a still more active role is needed for all educators, both school personnel and teacher educators, to take a proactive stance in changing the status of the profession. Initiatives such as active links with the lay community may help to deepen the understanding of and respect for teaching as it really is everyday; programs are possible in which local businesses and other non-educational agencies would receive some tax recognition in return for allowing interested employees on a regular basis to assist schools by spending time (a half-year, or one-half day per week, or two weeks per year, etc.) not only assisting teachers in a topic in which they have some interest and expertise, but also taking a co-teaching or team-teaching role with a teacher on that topic for a limited time. Other such formal links between laypersons and teachers could provide direct assistance to teachers in subject

matter, but far more important, would give a first-hand understanding of the challenge of teaching and would dignify its importance if legitimized in some way by employers and other leaders in the society. The long-term pay-off could be a building of community support and later national support for teaching and teachers, with the result that communities would value teaching far more than is the case in most communities in this country today by comparison with most other industrialized nations in the world.

Excellence and equity, then, by no means need be mutually exclusive concepts. In fact, by the increasing of diversity within the teaching profession to meet an increasingly diverse society, the chances for excellence are even improved if we at the same time take other initiatives both within our teacher education programs as well as in the forging of long-lasting links with the community and the society of which schooling must be seen as an inextricable part. The ideas presented in this set of Proceedings should indeed form the agenda for teacher education for the late 1980's and early 1990's.

David S. Martin
Chair, 1987 Annual
Meeting Planning Committee

EDUCATION IN THE YEAR 2000: 28TH CHARLES W. HUNT LECTURE

Ernest L. Boyer

When I was invited to talk about Education in the Year 2000, my first impulse was to paint an idyllic picture of children sitting at their well-programmed consoles, interacting with the video-cassette, chatting with each other at a high level of abstraction, and then assembling in small groups with a master teacher whose pedagogical tool is creative interaction, using what Mortimer Adler likes to call the "Socratic Method." I was tempted to predict this dream-like world for the year 2000, but of course I will not; we all know that the world of education, like all of life, has always been both messy and idyllic. Further, that magic year 2000 is only 13 years away, and when I turn the telescope of time back 13 years to 1974, I realize today's world seems pretty much the same. So there will be no "Gee Whiz/Buck Rogers" images in the world of education I will portray today. Still, caveats not withstanding, I am convinced that there are consequential changes in the wind, changes that will shape subtly but certainly education in this nation. Specifically, I should like to focus on four predictions about the way American education will be shifting as we move toward the year 2000 and beyond.

First, the face of young America is changing, and before we reach the year 2000, we may confront a major crisis in urban education in this nation. The point is that while white America is growing older, black and Hispanic America continue to grow younger. By the year 2000, almost one-third of all students in public education will be from minority homes, many of which are socially and economically disadvantaged. The tragedy is that these are precisely the students who have been least well served by education.

Today in many urban high schools, at least four out of ten students are absent on any given day. Almost half of the Hispanic students who enroll in public schools drop out before they are awarded a diploma. In Philadelphia, the drop-out rate is 38 percent; in Boston, it's 43 percent. In Chicago, in 1984, over half of the seniors failed to graduate, and among those who did, only a third were reading at the twelfth grade level. Last year in the Cleveland public schools, there was not a single semi-finalist in the National Merit Scholarship competition. Boston and Detroit each had only one high school in the system with semi-finalists.

What is disturbing is that the school reform movement is not confronting adequately this core of our educational dilemma; there remains an enormous gap between our rhetoric and results. What is coming toward the educational system in this country is a group of children who will be poorer, more ethnically and linguistically diverse. And these are precisely the students for whom our schools historically have been least successful.

Unless we deepen our commitment to the urban schools, the crisis in education will increase, and we could be left in this country with a kind of educational "Third World." I am convinced that if urban education does not become a national priority, if our spokesmen at the federal level do not remind us of our commitments and our conscience, the promise of excellence will remain sadly unfulfilled, and the prospects for us all will be dramatically diminished.

There are no easy panaceas; if there were apparent answers, we would have found them long ago. However, what is clear is that poverty and schooling are inextricably connected, and what we see as poor performance in the classroom may, in fact, be related to events that precede schooling – and even precede birth itself.

Let me give one example: the growing fetus requires a diet rich in vitamins, minerals, and proteins; yet, most poor mothers in this country are tragically undernourished. My wife is a certified nurse/midwife and delivers babies, including five grandchildren of her own. She works with adolescent pregnancy and helped establish a center for adolescent mothers in this city.

I'm told often of the shocking ignorance these young women have about their bodies, and of their poor diets as these pregnant girls are carrying another growing life. These are children having children, and unless we develop a more enlightened public policy the cycle of deprivation will persist.

The human brain grows most rapidly during the first year of life; and yet, today in the United States, 40 percent of all those classified as poor in America are children. Perhaps it is the first time in history when children are carrying the burden of poverty in the nation. Today, in the United States, nearly one out of every four children under six is classified as poor, and many of these children suffer malnutrition.

I realize that the talk about babies and poor health may appear far away from the school reform agenda. Yet the evidence is overwhelming: our educational problems cannot be divorced from the problems of the poor.

Winston Churchill observed that there is no finer investment for any community than putting milk into babies. And I am convinced that putting milk into the coming generation has something to do with excellence in education. As we move toward the year 2000, the issue we confront is this: will America continue to believe in education for all, or will it become a separated and divided nation?

This point brings me to venture prediction number two. The nation's homes and schools are inextricably connected, and in the coming years both the age of schooling and the calendar of schooling will be shifting to reflect the changing work and family patterns in the nation.

My Grandfather Boyer was born in the year 1872. He died one month short of his 100th year. And during the century of his birth, the world became a wholly different place, from his horse-drawn plow to John Glenn's lift-off into space. Incidentally, Grandpa Boyer never fully adjusted to man rocketing to the moon. When he was in his mid-90's, I said, "Grandpa, what do you think of man walking on the moon?" He looked at me with a twinkle in his eye and said, "Ernest, the moon was made to look at, not to walk on." I am convinced that, to his dying day, he thought moon walking was the fantasy of an errant grandson. Credibility can only be stretched so far.

Grandpa had grown up on a southwest Ohio farm and one day when he was 96, I asked him for the first time (I do not know why I waited so long) about the schooling he had had. He said he had gone to school three years—long enough to learn to read and write. He told me he had walked six miles to school and went only in the winter when he was not needed on the farm. (In-

cidentally, I have observed the distance one walks to school seems directly proportionate to one's age.)

When today's school calendar was established almost one century ago—with nine months of study and three months off—over 90 percent of all school children in this country were, like Grandpa Boyer, living on a farm with their mothers and fathers. They were working hard, staying home in the summer to tend the crops. The school calendar mirrored the work and family patterns of the nation.

Today that world has turned upside down. Less than 3 percent of American families today are now on farms and, in most households, both parents work away from home. Further, nearly one in five families in the United States is now headed by a woman; two-thirds of these mothers work. About half of the children now in the first grade will have lived in one-parent homes by the time they graduate from high school.

Today, there is a dramatic mismatch between the school calendar and the work and family patterns of the nation. When I was Commissioner of Education and we had a snow day (which means in Washington that about 3/4 of an inch had hit the ground!), school was cancelled. Work at the Office of Education had to be cancelled, too. (You may think that is educational progress.) Literally hundreds of employees would call in and say, "I'm sorry, I can't get to work . . . I don't know what to do with the kids today." The point is that the schools are engaged in a custodial function, and when there is a mismatch between the school calendar and the family pattern, the bureaucracy breaks down.

As I look into the future I believe that once again, the school schedule and the family schedule will begin to merge. I see three pieces to this pattern.

- First, looking to the year 2000, I predict more prekindergarten education. Already, because of working parents, over 40 percent of the nation's children are in prekindergarten programs. Incidentally, the National Governors' Association in that remarkable, almost heretical education publication they released last summer, *Time for Results*, said that it was the responsibility of the states to provide quality education for at-risk four-year-olds and "where possible, for three-year-olds as well." What is going on here? The nation's governors recommending schooling for three-year-olds? This recommendation, while radical, and with all of the agonies and dilemmas that it poses, touches the realities of contemporary life.

- Second, I predict that in the next fifteen to twenty years there will be more school enrichment programs in the afternoons. Today one out of every ten children comes home to an empty house or apartment, and as this latch-key problem grows, schools will operate on a longer day, offering after-hours programs such as special studies in science, computers, music, and athletics.

  For several years I had grandchildren in the Japanese public schools. I do not believe we should borrow the Japanese model. I do wish to point out, however, that in that system there were electives in the afternoon for children, partly to accommodate the family patterns.

- Third, I am convinced that between now and the year 2020, the school calendar will be lengthened. A three-month summer recess made sense when extra hands were needed in the fields, but it is an anachronism now, especially at a time when most parents work outside the home year-round.

Here then is the pattern I see emerging: prekindergarten programs, after-hours workshops, and summer sessions—all to fit the realities of family life, and in many urban areas these trends are already under way.

Let me make it clear that I do not necessarily applaud the patterns I am predicting, but I am suggesting they cannot be ignored. I also believe that once again, this nation will turn to the schools as "Mr. Fix-it," and that we in education will be asked to accommodate to the shifting patterns of the culture.

The danger I see, however, is that if we do not make accommodation, affluent families will find their own services—summer camps, private lessons, and youth clubs, for example—while poor children are allowed to drift. Consider one example: in 1983, 53 percent of upper- and middle-income families had their preschool children in special programs; only 29 percent of the at-risk three- and four-year-olds were so enrolled. So once again, the children who need the most help get the least. I suggest that if this gap is to be narrowed, new enrichment programs, which I wish to call "The Extended School," should be optionally available to all students, and not just the privileged few.

I would further urge that parents should pay for those extra services, rather than have them added to the already-overtaxed school burden. But I would also insist that for families who are poor, we have an extended version

of the Federal Chapter I, so children in these families would be eligible for such services and not in any way be held to disadvantage.

Some months ago on an ABC television special on Illiteracy in America an eleven-year-old boy in Harlem was interviewed. He said that he practiced Karate every night instead of doing homework because, "That's what we need to survive out in the streets."

If we do not have solid enrichment programs for poor children after school and in the summer to keep them learning instead of drifting, I am afraid the gap between the "haves" and the "have-nots" in this country will continue to expand.

This brings me to issue number three, which, I must confess, is more of a hope than a clear prediction. It is my urgent hope that by the year 2000, this nation will give more recognition and more status to the teacher, because long after we have heard from all the experts from Mt. Olympus, and long after the legislators have passed all their recommendations, what will really matter will be the quality and the integrity of the teachers who meet with children every single day.

The truth is that while Americans have always had a love-affair with education, we have been enormously ambivalent about teachers. Dan Lortie of the University of Chicago described this ambivalence when he wrote that teaching in this country is at once both honored and disdained; it is praised as dedicated service and it is lampooned as easy work. He said that our real regard for teachers has never matched our professed regard.

This lack of real regard for teachers is not new. When we were writing our Carnegie Foundation report *High School*, I read a fascinating story about a nineteenth-century Nebraska school that colorfully described the attitude even then, a hundred years ago. The writer in his autobiography said that, "When they invited the first teacher to our school, we ran him out of town, using stones as weapons of assault." The second teacher met the same agony. But when the third teacher had soundly thrashed one boy and had also thrashed the father of another, the reign of terror ended. (Sometimes parents need to be chastised, too.) Still the writer concluded, "Many students in that one-room Nebraska school considered the teacher Public Enemy Number One."

Today we do not stone our teachers or openly run them out of town, but we do expect them to work miracles every day. They are called upon not only to teach the basics, but also to monitor the playground, to police for drugs, to reduce pregnancy, to teach students how to drive, to eliminate graf-

fiti; when teachers fall short anywhere along that line, we condemn them for not meeting our idealized expectations. The simple truth is that we expect schools and teachers to do what our homes and our communities and our churches have not been able to accomplish. Indeed, it is my conviction that the school is not the most imperiled institution; it is the family structure that is imperiled, and the school is absorbing the shock waves of the family in transition.

Most school critics could not survive one week in the very classrooms which they so eloquently condemn. Yet what I find troublesome about the current reform movement is the growing preoccupation with the regulatory aspects of the profession. We hear a lot of talk these days about procedures for licensing and certifying, for screening people out, and for testing those already in. Improving credentialing and certifying is absolutely crucial, but what is often lost is the simple recognition that teaching is a human enterprise, and that we must give equal weight to teacher recognition and renewal and, in the end, recruitment, too. What good are teacher standards if we cannot attract and hold the brightest and the best?

There are poor teachers to be sure, and a top priority is for the teaching profession to police itself, but it is also true that no profession is made healthy by focusing only on what is bad. Yet the current preoccupation is with locating failure, rather than with the affirmation of success. This is an attitude that is guaranteed to place pathology in the system. If you get out of bed each morning, look in the mirror and say, "I'm going to the dogs," I guarantee you will be in a catatonic state within a week. The only way to get out of bed and "do what must be done," as Garrison Keillor said, is to have confidence and to move from strength to strength. That point is true for the teaching profession, too: if we do not affirm the good, we will cause a sense of pathology and distress among the army of positive and committed people who are performing heroic actions every single day.

Thus, in our search for excellence, we must give more status, empowerment, and dignity to teaching if this nation's future is to be secure.

We must also recognize that some of the most essential qualities of teaching are the ones that are most difficult to measure. Several years ago I was unable to sleep, and instead of counting sheep, I counted all the teachers I had had. There were a few nightmares in the crowd, but I remembered rather vividly fifteen or more. Then I recalled the great teachers I had had, the outstanding individuals in colleges and in schools who had truly changed my life. First I thought about my first-grade teacher, of whom I have spoken a thousand times. On the first day of school my teacher said, "Today we learn

to read," and made it clear that language and learning are forever interlocked.

I recalled Mr. Whittlinger, my high school history teacher, who one day said quietly in class, "Ernest, I'd like to meet you after class." I nearly had cardiac arrest – sweaty palms, eyes glazed over. As it turned out, it was a consequential and enduring meeting although Mr. Whittlinger spoke only briefly. He said, "Ernest, you're doing very well in class; if you keep this up, you just might be a student." Now, you may take that as a put-down, but it was the most energizing academic observation I had ever heard. It was the first time a teacher had said, "You just might be a student." He rattled my brain; I redefined who I was, and for better or worse, I have spent a lifetime in education because a teacher took fifteen seconds to help me think about who I was and raise my aspirations. The comment was based more on hope than evidence, to be sure, but this teacher took the risk.

I thought also of Dr. Joseph Smith, a literature professor, who loved to read Shakespeare aloud in class. He taught me something about the majesty of language; he laughed, and he cried – even though he had read *King Lear* and *MacBeth* a thousand times before.

I wondered to myself in the wee hours of the morning what made these teachers truly great and, while we are searching for the yardsticks for teacher credentialing, I had to go back to these three great people in my life. They were very different individuals, but as I thought about each one, it occurred to me that there were three things they shared in common.

- First, these teachers were knowledgeable and well-informed. They had a message to convey; there was something there to teach.

- Second, these three teachers were able to communicate in a way that the students understood. I have had teachers who knew a lot, but they somehow could not make *connections* with their students. They did not understand the level of reception. The second characteristic, then, was the capacity to communicate, because they knew children and young people.

- But then there was a third characteristic that made these teachers truly great. The more I thought about it, it occurred to me these were truly outstanding individuals because they were open and authentic human beings. They laughed, they cried, they said "I don't know." There was a quality to their lives that transcended both the knowledge and the capacity to send the message, too.

Secretary of Education Bennett talks frequently about teaching values. I am not sure how that converts itself into the curriculum. I am convinced, however, that the values that we seek are the ones conveyed through the patterns of the teacher, through the quality of the life, through the integrity of the message, through the ability to listen, and through the trustworthiness that is established in the relationship with students—those are the values that I think the classroom must convey.

I suspect that each of us can remember at least one great teacher she or he has had. If this were a Quaker meeting, I would suggest a moment of silence for us to pay tribute to the ones who have been enduringly influential, and I cite Ralph Tyler and pay him high regard.

But if we are going to strengthen teaching, it will call for national policy as well. I believe we need national scholarship programs, and scholarship programs for high school teaching. We need to publicize the Talented Teacher Act that Congress passed that would give grants to the students who agree to teach in the nation's public schools. After all, we encourage people to go into the Peace Corps. Why not inspire them, and appeal to their altruism, to teach in the inner cities here at home?

Further, why do we not have summer fellowships for gifted high school teachers, so they can be intellectually enriched? Everyone with gray hair can remember the absolutely dramatic impact of the NDEA Fellowships, in which the President of the United States inspired us to understand that if we were going to stand tall as a nation, we were going to invest in our teachers. The influence of those fellowships can be felt even now after several decades.

We need teacher-excellence funds in every school—to help teachers implement a good idea. We need teacher-travel funds to help teachers stay in touch with fellow professionals all across the nation. And I believe we need to start recruiting the young people who are in our high schools today. There is no magic teacher pool that is going to emerge from heaven; the teachers of tomorrow are sitting in our classrooms now. Why are we not pausing to say to the best and the brightest, "You're good enough to be a teacher"?

I am suggesting that, to secure the future of this nation, we should be less concerned about getting new weapons into space and more concerned about getting outstanding teachers into the classrooms here on Earth.

This brings me to observation number four: I predict that as we move toward the year 2000, the curriculum in the nation's schools increasingly must be focused on the future, not the past.

I find it significant that during 1983, in addition to the report of the National Commission on Excellence in Education, three other major statements were released. One of these, by the National Academy of Science, warned about the so-called "Greenhouse Effect"—the gradual warming of the earth's atmosphere by excessive carbon dioxide in the air. Another report by a group of equally distinguished scholars predicted that a nuclear holocaust could leave half the earth in frozen darkness.

A group of outstanding biologists, also in 1983, quite coincidentally, reported that deforestation of the tropical rain forests, which harbor at least two-thirds of all the earth's animals, plants, birds, and insects, are being destroyed at the rate of about 100,000 square kilometers every single year. That is an area about the size of the state of Missouri.

I firmly believe that these three reports were also reports on education. Just as surely as the nation is at risk, so is the universe at risk. I wonder—I worry in fact—that education is getting more parochial at the very moment that the agenda is more global. As I look toward the year 2000, I am convinced that with every passing year, we will discover through the headlines, that ecologically, economically, socially, and politically, we are connected to others on the planet Earth, and that to be truly educated, our students must begin to put their own lives in perspective.

I am suggesting that the curriculum for the year 2000 means not only preparing more technicians who can help build better rockets and computers; it also means preparing more historians and humanists as well. And it means helping us to discover our own connections on the planet Earth—not more Carnegie units, but more integration of knowledge.

Several years ago in the *Christian Science Monitor* I read about an organization called the International Council on Monuments and Sites. This group had selected 165 very special places on the planet Earth which they said were of universal value to mankind. They included in the list such landmarks as the Pyramids of Egypt, the Palace of Versailles, the city of Cuzco in Peru, Persepolis in Iran, the Katmandu Valley in India, the Old Walls of Jerusalem—just to name a few. It was an effort to identify *internationally* the sacred sites and monuments just as we do it here at home.

As I read that list, the thought occurred to me—a fantasy, to be sure—that these priceless treasures might provide a marvelous curriculum for our schools. I wondered if it would be possible for all students throughout their years of formal learning to learn about these magnificent monuments and sites that are found on all continents of the globe. I wondered if it would be possible for students to study not just the monuments, but also the people, the

history, and the transitions that produced them. I also wondered if it would be possible for every student to understand that we have a sacred obligation not to desecrate these monuments and sites that mark so exquisitely the human passage here on Earth. Perhaps as a capstone seminar in the senior year, students might look at just one site and learn about it intensively—and have an appreciation of a culture other than their own?

I am suggesting that the curriculum in our schools is not just the acquiring of bits of information; it must also mean integration and application, too. There is an urgency about establishing the importance of connections. Lewis Thomas, of Memorial Sloan-Kettering Cancer Center, wrote that if this century does not slip forever through our fingers, it will be because learning will have directed us away from our splintered dumbness, and will have helped us focus on our common goals.

One final observation. As I look toward the year 2000, I am convinced we must focus more on how students learn, and become much more sophisticated about how to measure the results—the theme that Ralph Tyler has spoken about so carefully for so many years. I find it discouraging that 60 years after the Scholastic Aptitude Test was invented to measure the innate aptitude of students, the Secretary of Education just this week put SAT numbers on a wall chart and presented it as a "report card" on the success and failure of the nation's schools.

Is this where we have come in 60 years? Is it too much to hope that by the year 2000—thirteen years away (we should get busy!)—we will have subtle and authentic ways to measure the potentiality and the progress of our students? Even if the SAT did measure success in language and mathematics, what about history? What about science? What about civics? What about literature? What about the arts? To say nothing about the ability to think clearly and to integrate what has been learned. And what about the students who do not take the SAT?

Some exciting work is being done by Howard Gardner at Harvard. In his provocative and insightful book *Frames of Mind,* Gardner reminds us that children have not only verbal intelligence; they also have logical intelligence, mathematical intelligence, spatial intelligence, and I suspect intuitive and social intelligence as well. Gardner suggests, quite properly I believe, that we should find ways to better understand the many dimensions of intelligence in our children, and to assess these potentials with great care.

We need testing in our schools to measure student progress. American citizens want to know if the $140 billion annual investment they are making in public education is paying off. But it is also true that our measurements today

are very crude. Using narrow tests we tell children they are failures before they have even discovered who they are. To me, that is a crime of inestimable proportion.

If our goal is to educate all children, we must broaden our definition of *potential.* We must honor the full range of God-given talent within each child, and if we do not, we will diminish our civilization, and perhaps our prospects for survival, too.

Here, then, is my conclusion. As we move rapidly to the year 2000, we must confront the problems of poor children in the cities and in the rural areas as well. We must respond to the changing work and family patterns of the nation. We must give empowerment to the teacher. We must focus the curriculum on the future, not the past. And we must figure how to measure progress in ways that affirm the potentiality of all students, not just the privileged few.

James Agee wrote on one occasion that with every child who is born, under no matter what circumstance, the potentiality of the human race is born again. I salute all educators for your abiding faith in the potentiality of our children, and I thank you for inviting me and honoring me here.

THE MISSION OF COLLEGES OF EDUCATION

Governor Bill Clinton

I speak to you today as Chairman of the Education Commission of the States. In the introduction you were told that I am the only governor to be both Chairman of the Governor's Association and the Education Commission of the States. This seems to be an insane thing to do, but I did it with a deliberate purpose in mind. Whether we succeed or not remains to be seen, but my idea is that now everybody is working on more or less the same track. If we could all work together and have a more common agenda and understand what we can do to support one another, we can get more done more quickly. I really think that we do not have as much time to do some of the things we need to do and so I feel an overwhelming sense of urgency to try to get some common ground established with all the education groups, the political leaders, and the business community.

I know that teacher educators have taken a lot of "lumps" in the last few years. I have dealt out a few of those lumps, but I am really proud of these people that are here on the podium with me because of the work they have done to try to improve higher education in general and teacher preparation in particular.

Our institutions in Arkansas have all committed to meeting the new standards and I am proud of that. I do not know how many states are going to do that, but every one of our schools say they are going to do that. I can tell you that the people here on this podium and others who are not represented have in my view made a major commitment to improving the quality of their programs. I would also like to report that, notwithstanding the declines in higher education enrollment from place to place around the country, we have found that after we raised the Commission's standards for our teacher education programs, our enrollment went *up*. The better the programs got, the more people wanted to be in them. I have great hope for the role that can be played by the colleges of teacher education in meeting the challenges before us.

Having said that, the news is not all good. "A Nation at Risk," the report which came out in early 1983, was followed by only two states, Florida and Mississippi, which enacted really comprehensive school reforms before the report came out. Then, there was a whole raft of states which did it afterwards – raised taxes, raised standards, did all the things that you are familiar with regarding education reform. I think Arkansas was the third state. Now virtually every state in the country has enacted some form of comprehensive education effort. In all of those, you were probably involved either as the subject or as the participant in what was to be done. I think much has been accomplished.

Secretary William Bennett's report came out recently, and you may or may not think it is adequate, accurate, or sufficient, but it does plainly show that in certain significant areas, progress is being made. Our state test scores are uniformly up, and racial and regional differences among the people taking the test are down. The dropout rate is down rather significantly in our state in spite of the fact that we have added more testing and more rigor to the programs.

On the other hand, it is impossible to look at the numbers with anything like real optimism. If you examine what passes for progress and measure that against the competition around the world it is rather frightening.

I was at the Mayflower Hotel a couple of hours ago. I was going down the stairs and I passed a bank of pay phones. One fellow was talking very loud, saying, "You don't have to fool with that company, go see this other one; they do all their keypunching in Jamaica and it's lots cheaper." If you were in my state, you would not say that very loudly in a public pay telephone. In Arkansas we have lost a lot of jobs because many factories have closed and many farmers are now bankrupt. Our Medicaid budget in the first quarter of this year was up 27 percent over the first quarter of last year – no increase in

rates, no increase in services, just increase in utilization. Many of our people are being ground under the pressures of the international economy.

But the telephone caller was making a good point. All over the world today there are people who can do what we do as well as we do it for wages we cannot live on. If we are constrained at all to build our economy on comparative labor costs from where we are now, that is a loser for us. We will have to wait for the whole world to catch up with us before we can have real growth again. It is broad based. That means two or three generations with declining income and that is significant.

It started in 1973 when real median family income began to decline. Between 1979 and 1985 our country created 12 million jobs. No new jobs in Europe – that was the good news. Everybody is proud of it. The bad news is that 42 percent of those jobs were *at or below the poverty level.* In the previous six-year period, 12 million new jobs were created and only 22 percent of them were at or below the poverty level. In the previous ten-year period 20 million new jobs were created and only 21 percent of them were at or below the poverty level. Between 1981 and 1986, 40 percent of the American people had a real increase in their income. Twenty percent held their own, 40 percent had a real decline.

Now I ask you this simple question as Americans, and think about the values you were raised with and the hopes that you nourished: if this little chart for the last five years, with 40 percent getting richer, 20 percent holding on, and 40 percent getting poorer were run out in the history of America for 10 or 20 years, will we have the country you grew up in? Will we have the American dream that you cherished as available to all? I think it is a serious question. We might still have the Route 128 Corridor in New England and the Silicon Valley in California, and for that matter urban Little Rock competing rather well in a world economy with a high job growth rate. But the inequality in this country will be so profound that it will be hard to hold America together as we know it.

I was talking last night on the plane with William Milliken, the founder of the Cities and School Program. I told him this data. He said, "You know if that's right and these lines continue like you say, and I think they might, we're going to have trouble in the 1990s that will make the '60s look pale by comparison."

You are preparing people to go into public schools to deal with that problem, and the people you are preparing who are going in the schools may be the last chance we will ever have to give them the tools to help turn those conditions around. So, in spite of all the lumps you have taken and the

criticism which is fair and the criticism which is not, I think you ought to be proud to be doing what you are doing because I think that you are participating in an effort to regenerate our education system, and you are dealing with issues that we have never had to deal with before in our schools. If we succeed, we will secure our country's position in the world and the promise of prosperity for Americans. If we fail, we will have profound and dark consequences.

It is always good to be involved in something important. One of the consequences of being involved in something important is that if you fail, it is bad for everyone. You ought to be glad to be here and to be a part of that today, but I do not think we should be too optimistic even though a lot has been done. We must think about the underlying economic trends; we have got to turn them around not by creating new jobs but by making sure that people can do what needs to be done. That is what plagues me. I wake up every morning and go to bed at night thinking about it.

Last year I agreed to serve as chairman of the Southern Growth Policies Board solely because it was the sixth year in our cycle and every sixth year we have a Commission on the Future of the South which issues a report on what we in the South must do to make our region more economically productive. I wanted to appoint the Commission because I thought I knew 20 good people in the South that would come to grips with these issues and the complex but profound relationship between education and economic development. The report that they issued, I think, is a sort of economic development version of "A Nation at Risk." It is very well written, short, to-the-point, and we admit to a lot of our past errors. If you want a copy of it I will be glad to give it to you; if you do not live in the South, you still might find it valuable because it attempts to be rather specific about the kinds of education investments we need to make.

This year in Arkansas we issued a report called, "Jobs for Arkansas' Future." If you are from Connecticut, you live in the first state that did something like this.

Arthur White, of the famous public opinion research firm, developed a project in Connecticut with the state government to specify what the job opportunities were for Connecticut between now and the year 2000 and what kinds of educational and other investments would have to be made in order to reach those maximum opportunities, given where they were. I persuaded him that he ought to do the same thing in a rural state that had more economic problems, and this report is the result. If you want one of these I will give it to you. If you are not from Arkansas, the only value to you is that you will see that there is a way in your state to plot from where you are right now, what the

actual economic opportunities are likely to be, and then what kinds of specific investments you will have to make in education if you want to maximize those opportunities.

Those are the kinds of things people like me to do. We set the state or frame the debate and draw the perimeters. But I do not really create any jobs or teach any children. Or more to the point, I do not teach anybody who is going to teach children. I think what we have to try to talk about now is what is going to be your role in all of this. I must say that I am not professionally competent to judge whether everybody ought to follow the recommendations of the Holmes Group in their institution. My hunch is that there is more than one right way to do it, more than one good way to do it, but that there needs to be a real commitment to excellence.

I do not want to get into the debate on alternative certification, but I can tell you that if you support all of these school standards that all the states are adopting, some of us will come up to the deadline for the standard and not have sufficient numbers to certify teachers coming through the traditional mechanism. So we must have some kind of alternative certification; my message is that if you live in a state where that happens, then you ought to be taking the lead to figure out the most responsible, quality-oriented alternative certification you can have, and not be afraid if somebody can go through a different route and get to the same place.

Competition will not hurt you just like it does not hurt me. You know I would give anything if nobody ever ran against me for office; I believe deeply in a two-party system for everybody except me! As one of the immutable rules of politics, everybody in the world is for change in general but against it in particular.

But you can do that and you have done some of that, and I commend you on it because those are the kinds of things that only you can do. The governors cannot do it, and the legislators cannot do it. But I have seen our colleges of education improve the performance of their seniors coming out on the NTE exam, improve the quality of their programs to raise their standards for admission, and to render their activities more relevant to the urgent issues before us today. If there is anything that I can do as chairman of the Education Commission of States, or as chairman of the NGA to make sure you are in the mainstream debate on all of these issues and to be supportive of you, I want to do that. But you also need to recognize that you are carrying a big load that no one else can carry and that the stakes are higher than you even probably know. I do not think you ought to shut the door to debate on any issue.

I still think that we ought to do an even better job than we have done in getting people like you back in our schools. They need you out there. You must figure out what is the matter with what we are doing. You know if we are not doing a good job, and some of those tests say we are not in teaching science, math and higher-order learning skills, how are we going to do that? If we have an irrelevant sort of old industrial model running our schools, we must restructure it. You ought to have some say in how that is done.

If teachers ought to be involved more in decision-making in the schools, which everybody says ought to be the case, then we need to make sure that in the colleges of education we are teaching leadership. I believe that there are certain skills which can be taught and I do not believe that all leaders are born and not made. Everybody has in himself or herself the germ of the energy, the spark it takes, to get people going down the right road together. We need to focus more attention on that in the colleges of education.

I now invite you to bruise me on the way out the door here or write me a letter and say, "Yeah, that's all fine but here's what you need to do, here's how we've been let down by the politicians, here's what we need." I welcome that. But I know that, in spite of all the progress that has been made, it is deeply moving to me to see how far we have come in such a short time. We are still not where we need to be in teaching people to think and the ways they need to think in the world we have to live in. We are still letting too many people drop out or stay in when they might as well be dropped out. There will be different skills required to motivate these at-risk children. I know you can say, "I've heard that speech, we're loading it all on the teachers, we can't expect to do it all." That is true and there is a bigger load that has to be carried by business and churches, but the problem is, where are you going to get at these children except in school? I feel very strongly that if you put your minds to it you can teach people to teach those at-risk children better than they have been doing.

Whenever you get discouraged or disgusted, remember that in the year 2000 you do not want thirteen more years to have gone by aggravating those trends where 40 percent of the people are getting better off and the American Dream still exists for them, 20 percent are just where they started, and 40 percent are doing worse. We cannot hold it together.

I think the business community is making a good faith effort. I think government is beginning to understand more about competitiveness. I think certain bipartisan policies will probably emerge in the 1988 election season so that the other portions of our society can do their part. But if we do not educate people to do those kinds of jobs, they still will not be done and we will

fall still further behind. So, if the past is prologue, we are going to have a good future because you have done a lot to make improvements, and for that I am grateful. I am especially proud of the people who are good enough to sit here on this platform with me today. But if you look at the numbers, it is still sobering.

In closing I do not want this to be a "downer," but I just do not want you to minimize the responsibility you are carrying for the future of the country. I find it exhilarating and I hope you do, too. If you are around when the century turns, try to remember this day. You will be popping champagne corks and having a big time and thanking God you are one of the very few people that ever happened to live at the time that a century turned. If you are around then, think back to this time. I wager that the common assessment by the year 2000 of the period which started in 1973 and which will run another four or five years, will be that it was one of the watershed periods in American history. It was the period in which America was pulled down off its preeminent perch which it had occupied since the close of World War II and was rudely thrown back into world economic competition for which it was unprepared and tested economically as never before.

Now nobody knows what the rest of the story will be. We will either be saying, while we are drinking our champagne, that we met the task, restored growth and prosperity to our country and opportunity to our people, and kept alive the hold that freedom has on millions of people in countries like the Philippines, where people now want more political liberties and think you can have economic growth in a free society. Or, we will say we were not willing to do it, we could have done it but we were not willing, and so the sun began gently to set on the American empire, and we are gracefully going about our business while someone else runs the world. I honestly believe that what you do in those colleges of education will determine which one of those stories is told when the century turns and I wish you well.

TEACHER INDUCTION: A SOLVABLE PROBLEM

Kevin Ryan
Boston University

Lennie Bruce some twenty years ago said that humor was tragedy plus time, and I think that is very much related to the way we treat the first year of teaching, and the way we treat teachers. It seems to me as an educational community, as a group of teacher educators, we are confronted with an enormous set of problems – real social chaos. I read that in 1985 in one city, Los Angeles, 181 children were killed, most by young children, and similar statistics reflecting social breakdowns assault us every day.

In the last two decades we have seen the support for our field, for education, dwindle significantly. We have seen a massive shift of money from programs for the young to programs for the aged. We have seen an epidemic of escapism among the young, from television to drugs to promiscuity. We have seen children being poorly supervised by overworked and overpleasured parents. We have seen an enormous influx of immigrants and their children are presenting our schools with challenging difficulties, and we are continually plagued by the inadequacies of the schools serving the children of

the poor. Against this background, the subject here under discussion, the problem of the employment adjustments of beginning teachers, pales. However, I like this problem and the reason I like it is because I think it is a very solvable problem. It is a problem that, if we focus our energies, I believe we can solve, and we can put it to rest. We can chalk it up to the win column and move on to something else.

But why now? I think one reason we ought to address this problem now is because we are going to experience an enormous influx of new teachers in the next five years. We expect to have 50% turnover of the current teaching staff in five years. Many of the teachers that will come into our schools will not come through teacher training. There will be emergency certificates of all kinds. Also, I believe that the public schools now are much harder places in which to teach than they have been in years past.

But what is the problem? At one level, the problem is that 40% of the people that will start teaching next September will leave the profession by the end of their second year. Of course, some still go on to graduate school in other fields. Some will stay home and have children. Some will win the lottery and write the great American novel about schools! But I think a more basic reason that people leave is because they do not like teaching. Not that it just is not fun, but rather that it is downright punishing. It is not what they thought is was going to be. This phenomenon is rather starkly captured by what is called the "curve of disenchantment," which is a curve developed by a researcher by the name of Joseph Ligana, who aggregated all the data he could get his hands on from over 40 studies using the *Minnesota Teacher Attitude Inventory.* Ligana looked at the attitudes of people in preservice training, and found that the longer they went through training, the more positive their attitude became towards children, and toward the profession. Even through student teaching their attitudes improved. And even in September of their first year of teaching their attitudes became more positive. Probably because children are obeying them and appear to be taking in the teaching messages they are speaking. New teachers – on the average – feel great satisfaction with their new careers. However, inspection of Ligana's curve suggests something to the effect that at 10:45 on October 8th, the first-year teacher's world falls in. The curve drops and continues to drop until February. Ligana's research goes on and shows that although the attitude curve begins at that point to level off and show a slight improvement, an improvement which continues throughout the career of a teacher, it never gets back up to where it was in preservice preparation.

Exactly ten years ago this Spring, a group of us from Ohio State University began a study of the first year of teaching. A number of the individuals involved were not at all sure this was an area which was worth studying. So, I invited in for an informal discussion of their first year four graduates

of the previous year's program, students that I did not know, but who had just received their degrees the previous spring and were out teaching in the local schools. It was a very lively session. There were many tales about things they were experiencing. All of it was interesting. Finally toward the end of the afternoon, I turned to one young woman who had not said anything. Actually, she kept looking down during most of this conversation.

I said, "Could you tell us what happened to you?"

And she did not look up, but said in a low voice, "You lied to me."

And I said, "Pardon me?"

She said, "You lied to me."

And I replied, "My dear, I don't even know you. I never lied to you."

She said, "Oh, not you. But I did my degree here. I took classes in this very building. And you didn't tell us what it was going to be like out there. It's terrible."

She went on and poured out her anguish of her year and that restarted the others and, I think, we reached a new level of candor.

One of the things that happened that afternoon is that the seven of us realized that the plight of first-year teachers is truly a problem which we ought to be looking at. What we tried to do in our first year teacher study, which I will not discuss in any detail, was to map out what we call the "life space" of a first-year teacher. When the first year of the eighteen new teachers we studied was over, we asked them to chart on a sheet of paper their feelings about their first year. It was not exactly the same questions the *Minnesota Teacher Attitude Inventory* tried to shed light on, but similar. Instead of lines similar to Ligana's levels of disenchantment, the graphic showing these new teachers' levels of satisfaction over the year looked like eighteen strands of wet spaghetti thrown against the wall. We could see no neat pattern. However, there were plenty of highs and lows.

This area is one which has had a great deal of research. In 1982, Fred McDonald released a large study of induction process with beginning teachers. Ken Zeichner and his colleagues at the University of Wisconsin, Grant, Popkowitz, and Tabachnik, have done a number of studies in this area, showing, for example, the attitude change of first-year teachers as they move from a very student-oriented attitude in the beginning toward a much more custodial/management change by the end of the school year.

Susan Beaman did a summary for the *Review of Educational Research*, entitled "Problems for Beginning Teachers," and identified the eight most frequent problems that first-year teachers find: classroom discipline, motivating students, dealing with individual differences, assessing students' work, relationships with parents, organization of classwork, insufficient or inadequate teaching materials and supplies, and dealing with problems of individual students.

There has been a long parade of teacher educators and researchers who have focused on this problem. Among them are the late Francis Fuller, Gary Griffin, Gene Hall, Shirley Hord, Sharon Feiman-Nemser, Walter Doyle, John Johnston, Arthur Wise, Elizabeth Eddy, and Colin Lacey from England. Even Willard Waller in his classic *Sociology of Teaching* gave substantial attention to this issue.

What emerges to me from this research is a picture of young adults, many of whom have entered teaching out of quite altruistic motives, hopeful of beginning a rich career. Instead, after an initial period of euphoria, something happens. They begin to bore the children, and the children first become restless, and then the children become dissatisfied and they react. They, the students, had high hopes for the year; they hoped that this year things were going to be different. They were excited about having a new teacher, and particularly one who seemed interested in them, so ready to please. This beginning has many endings: teachers gradually lowering their expectations, or blaming the victim, or major confrontations and tests of wills with students, or stories of straight triumph, or stories of triumph to hell and back, or stories of simple hell.

It is for many of these young teachers the first and worst hell that they will know. They have studied and planned to be teachers, and in the midst of their first year of teaching, things are falling apart. They realize, too, it is not "my dirty little secret" alone. It is common knowledge in the classroom. It is common knowledge in the faculty room. And it is common knowledge in the principal's office.

I am currently meeting with a group of people who graduated from our own program at Boston University last June. We meet on odd Friday afternoons in a campus bar and have beer and valium. They tell me about their week, and go around the table describing how they feel as if everyone is "standing on the sidelines watching them;" how they feel like they have been thrown totally to rely on their own resources; that little of the material that we have told them seems to fit with what they have to do. They are all surprised that things are so different from student teaching, when they were "cruising through Mr. Armstrong's class, and doing so well;" and their great discovery

about how one day the children can be such sweet dears, such little angels, and the next day, they are almost evil geniuses. It is all a tremendous shock to them.

As I listen to them, I keep thinking, "I read this before – this is straight out of the world of Willard Waller. This is straight out of *The Sociology of Teaching* that was written about the world of the 1920's." But there are differences. One that I want to suggest is the difference in their insecurity and vulnerability. Beginning teachers are much more naked than during earlier periods. Students are aware of what previously was the hidden world of teachers.

Much of what we have been observing and hearing about beginning teachers has been very well captured in a theory expounded by Joshua Meyerowitz in a book entitled *No Sense of Place.* Perhaps, the point can best be gotten by example. When I was in late elementary school and high school, there was an unspoken, but universal law among students that first-year teachers were to be tormented. It was in the order of things. I almost believe it has a genetic base. So, too, as a new teacher, I was tested with petitions that exams be open-book, that I give no homework on weekends, with affronts to my shaky sense of authority and with pranks such as bogus notes from the office and thumb tacks on my chair. But as both a tormentor and a tormentee, what was going on in the mind of the teacher, the impact of this testing, was unseen. The students could only guess at their effect.

Meyerowitz theory suggests things are quite different now. His theory first builds on Marshall McLuhan's view that mass communications, especially television, has fundamentally reordered social relations among people, particularly authority relations; and second, on Irving Goffman's social theory that human personality is made up of not a single solid thing, but that it is made up of a collection of role-behaviors (i.e., so that I am not a *single* personality, but a sum of several roles – the father role, the husband role, the out-of-town demi-expert, the "I-know-something-that-you-don't-know" role that I am currently playing).

The important part of Goffman's theory is that there is front-stage behavior and back-stage behavior. The first, front-stage behavior, is what the audience is supposed to see. Think, for instance, of someone being an attentive waiter in a restaurant. Once the waiter leaves you, the audience for his waiter role, and goes back into the kitchen, he slips into his back-stage role, out of sight of you, the primary audience. There he may complain of sore feet, of a pompous head-waiter, and worry aloud that you look like a poor tipper.

What Meyerowitz's theory suggests is that, largely due to television, people and children in particular, now see those back-stage behaviors, with clarity, regularity, and understanding. Children see on television adult parents anguishing about raising their children, about whether or not they should be too strict or too lenient. They see ministers and priests struggling with their own doubts about the existence of God. And more to the point, they see teachers in their back-stage, formerly private, moments as all-too-frail human beings stripped of mystery, exposing their confusion and admitting their weaknesses and inadequacies.

While television shows for some time have been presenting people like Mr. Kotter and a whole parade of other people as somewhat pathetic souls who put on a mask when they step in front of a classroom, five weeks ago we had a dramatic example of this phenomenon. Tom Brokaw and NBC, as part of television's voracious appetite to show us back-stage life in all spheres of life – from White House to the bedroom (and surely, if television could find a way, the White House bedroom) – pointed its mikes and lenses at the world of the first-year teacher. The teacher in this television white paper was struggling with her craft, with her front-stage behavior in full view of the students and the television audience, with several shots of young people's front-stage behavior playing extremely bored students. Then, the scene switched to the teacher anguishing about her sense of failure and inadequacy, and disappointment in her inability to confront students. Then, a change to the students, off-stage or back-stage, but this time full of life complaining about the teacher's ineffectiveness. Meanwhile, Tom Brokaw is nodding his agreement to everyone in sight that it is a problem. What I am suggesting is that television has taken the mystery out of teacher. He or she is naked before the students, pretending like so many television teachers that he is special, that he has special authority, that he is worth listening to, and worth respecting. But after the students have seen the new teacher's back-stage behavior, after seeing her weep in the teacher's lounge, it is hard to treat her in the old way. It is too tempting for the students to brush aside that uncertain front-stage behavior and try to get at those back-stage roles. The new teacher, then, has the old problems of the first-year teacher but has a new one too: little mystery, little built-in authority. He or she often has to beg or bargain for a chance to act like a teacher.

What happens to first-year teachers is frequently the stuff of jocular war stories. Everyone has his/her own cachet of little horror stories concerning the first year of teaching. A friend of mine once said that the best gift God has given us is our capacity to forget. My guess is that one of the reasons this old problem endures in teaching is due to teachers, to our capacity to forget, to block out the actual pain and suffering involved in our first years of teaching. In fact, it is my impression that many teachers are invested in this trial-by-

fire first year, in the same way that fraternity members, having gone through the initiation rites, fight against its elimination. Surviving this trial by fire is, after all, something of a badge of honor.

What Can Be Done

I would like to turn now to some possible ways out of this problem of initiation into teaching. I am convinced that there is not one solution, but many solutions to the first-year teaching syndrome. Some of the suggestions I shall make will solve some problems; some will suggest others, and I am sure there is much I shall miss.

I have divided these solutions into two kinds: the kinds that we in higher education can effect, and second, some of the things that can be done in school. There is, of course, a whole area of larger, restructuring suggestions, the kinds that John Goodlad has been making about fundamentally changing the teaching profession, and the sorts of changes that the Holmes Group are advocating. They seem to be changes that are going to take much more time and much more political support than I can see currently, so I am excluding them from this discussion and will try to deal with solutions that I think are do-able in the world today.

The college-based solutions: The first solution is to teach to the problem. What I mean by this is to share with prospective teachers the information that we know about the first year. Don't keep it a secret. Show prospective teachers the curve of disenchantment. Tell them what we know, what the research shows. But more importantly, I think we ought to share with them the stories, the biographies of teachers, and the various case study accounts.

To the degree that we are able, we ought to insure that our curriculum is engaging them in the sorts of problems most of them will confront: the authority problems, the management problems, and the rest of those common difficulties. From what teachers tell me, our courses and our textbooks are filled with images of the school and the child that surely are not currently valid and may never have been; that our preparations is too theoretical, by which they mean ineffective and "out-of-sync," and filled with what I call "Happy Think." For instance, many educational writers and many professors of education are like the late Father Flanagan of Boys Town: we never met a bad boy. Many first-year teachers meet bad boys, or (in concession to those who deny our capacity for evil) good boys who are putting on a darn good act!

The second suggestion for higher education is that we need to insure that we have adequate field experiences in teacher education. This is nothing

new. However, we need to do much more than put people in the field and have them play teacher's assistant. They need to question and learn from those teachers and administrators, and focus on what these experienced people have learned that can be useful to beginners, and what mistakes they have seen beginners make. So, it is not just field experiences, but adding a focus on the induction, so the prospective teacher can use that time they have at the university to prepare themselves for the predictable problems.

A third suggestion is that universities ought to have special outreach inservice courses for beginning teachers. Instead of having the first-year teacher come back to the university for a course in models of teaching or a course in principles of curriculum, we ought to have the university go out to the schools, and provide a neutral place where the new teachers in the district can get help with their problems, where we can look at some of the common problems, and work out very concrete strategies. This particular approach is being used at some universities. The model that I have in mind for such a course is "Support/Survival/Success."

There is some resistance in universities, because this idea does not sound like a graduate course. However, it is a professional course, and as such ought to be given credit as the first course in a Master's Degree in Education.

A fourth suggestion is that the university ought to invite back every Spring their recent Education graduates, to honor them, to listen to them, to reflect with them on the teacher education curriculum, and also to rekindle what may be dampened fires. But most of all, we ought to show them that we are all part of this profession, and we need them to help us to keep teacher education, or get teacher education on target. And most of all, let them know that we really care about them and what they are doing.

Those are the suggestions for higher education: we need to teach vigorously and honestly about the first year of teaching; we need to focus our field experiences more directly; we need to offer courses for and about beginning teachers; and we ought to bring our graduates back for mutual learning.

In-school solutions: The second category is in-school approaches. There are a number of things we can do here. First of all, each school should have an initiation orientation program. Most school systems have such things, but what I am suggesting is a program that is much longer (two or three weeks), that is much more detailed, focused on not just the routines and regulations and procedures of the district (although that is important and they need to get special help in that), but focusing on their essential task as teachers, that gives them plenty of opportunity and help in planning the first

month of instruction so that they get a running start. Such an orientation program would not end with the start up of school, but would bring the first-year teachers together on a regular basis, during the first year dealing with the problems as they unfold. For instance, many beginning teachers are totally "blind-sided" by the first marking period. They are not prepared for it at all. With such an orientation program, once they do get started teaching, they begin to be pointed toward the realities of evaluation.

A second suggestion is the workload of the beginning teacher. As much as possible this should be tailored to their beginning status, and their particular strengths and weaknesses. If this point sounds obvious, we also all know that it rarely happens. The veteran teacher leaves. His or her "plums," the choice classes and assignments, are redistributed to the other veterans, those who remain. The beginning teacher comes in and gets the curricular and extra-curricular carcass – the leftovers. As a new teacher, I was assigned to a study hall with 126 juniors and seniors, and not too many of them were terribly impressed that I had come "hot" from Teachers College, Columbia, where, as I recall, I had not heard about such situations. I am not even sure I knew what a study hall was, let alone taught anything which would help me survive one. So, we need to have special attention to assure that the beginning teacher is not over-challenged and that the job fits their strengths.

A third suggestion is mentor programs. Mentoring is a relatively new word for us in education; it has come to most of us from Yale psychologist Daniel Levenson (by way of Gail Sheehy's book *Passages*). To find the right name for an older, more experienced man who guides an aspiring younger man, Levenson selected a word straight from Homer's *Odyssey*. When Odysseus left on his twenty-year junket, he left his son Telemachus in the hands of his competent friend, whose name was Mentor. If we can trust Homer, apparently Mentor did a pretty fair job of protecting and educating Telemachus. Levenson describes the mentor/novice relationship as one of the most complex and developmentally important relationships that a man can have in early adulthood. Levenson to that point had only studied men, although he is currently looking at the development of women.

The mentor's function is to support and facilitate the realization of the Dream. The mentor believes in the protege, shares his dream, gives it his blessing, helps to divine a newly emerging self in its newly discovered world, and creates a space in which the young man can work out a reasonably satisfactory life structure that contains the dream. He also goes on to report how helpful being a mentor is to the adult who, in his mid-life, has probably achieved most of his goals, and he talks about how this relationship both enriches the person's satisfaction and his generativity.

This concept of mentorship has been rather quickly seized on by educators. The natural process of mentoring by an experienced teacher frequently goes on in schools, but it cannot be guaranteed, cannot be counted on. Because often nature does not seem to work, some educators have decided to develop a *paid* mentorship. More than that, beginning teachers are *assigned* to the paid mentors and usually they are part of a special program. States like California, Florida, Pennsylvania, and others have begun statewide mentor programs, and many more are in the planning stage. Cities like New York, Cincinnati, the district of Charlott/Mecklenburg have had apparently very successful programs. California passed mentor legislation in 1983 and since then, 83% of the districts are involved in mentor programs. Each teacher is selected by a mentor selection committee. They receive a stipend of $4,000; they also receive $2,000 to attend conferences, for administrative fees, for substitutes, and for other activities.

What mentors do is less clear. However, in some locales their job is to aid the beginning teacher clearly designated teaching competencies: lists of skills that represent a certain level of teaching competence.

In effect, many of these programs have an accountability system that goes along with the mentor program. Also, there is usually a mentor selection committee composed of teachers and administrators, and sometimes members of the lay public, who decide who qualifies. As a few of the people in this program reported to me, these committees can be a real "political football."

While the psychological research gives a strong endorsement to mentoring, it is unclear as yet whether or not these programs are going to make a positive difference. On the surface, it would seem that having a wise, experienced teacher take the younger teacher under his or her wing would be a natural success. "Natural" is the key word here. Are these mentor programs force-feeding a relationship that ought to be voluntary and spontaneous? Can you assign mentors and really have confidence that the relationship will work? There was a strong suggestion in a recent report by the Rand Corporation that the mentor in the Florida program is all-too-often seen as just another person with a checklist, just another hurdle for the first-year teacher to jump over. So, while this is a very promising idea, I believe that it is one we need to look at more closely, and see if it does indeed have a positive impact.

Conclusion

By way of summarizing, let me say that, first, we have good evidence that our entrance system appears to have a negative impact on the way people teach and on the way they feel about their profession and on their longevity in the profession. And, this induction system undoubtedly has negative effects

on students and their learning. Second, I am convinced that we know enough to solve this problem, or more appropriately, to lessen the negative impact on the first-year teacher. While I have made no attempt to cost out these solutions, it seems to me that in any grand scheme, having a good teacher make a good start should be a high priority and would be worthwhile in dollars and cents. So, I believe that we have solutions at hand, and none too early, because we are also expecting this enormous retirement from teaching in the next few years, and we will have this new wave of teachers coming in. But, it also seems to me that we are gearing up, in good old American/Henry Ford/Robert McNamara/Lee Iaccoca fashion, and we will try to do it on the grand scale, the statewide induction program, the statewide mentoring program, the big university/school cooperative effort, involving released-time for everyone.

While I have faith that the programs will probably do some good, I want to sound a cautionary note. As I have said, I believe that for the problem of the beginning teacher, the problems are quite solvable, but they only may be solvable through time, through experience, and through people. It may be that the problem of the first-year teacher is much more wrapped up with being 22 years old. It may have much more to do with young people trying to make the adjustment to what they want to be, what they think they are, and what they discover they actually are and what they are able to do.

It may be that the big professional induction program is not the solution; that the *assigned* mentor is really doing it for a different set of motives, for the $4,000, for getting away from teaching, having free time, for that $2,000 budget we would all love to have. Maybe the elaborate orientation program, or the special university induction program, is just one more barrier, one more thing that the first-year teacher has to push through, to deal with during this most busy year. Instead, it may be that the solution to this professional problem is much more personal. The solution may reside in those of us in university teacher education programs, programs which ought to be much more graphic and vivid in presenting to the young what may initially be depressing or disappointing pictures of the first year, by getting them oriented to the kinds of things that other teachers have experienced.

All of this suggests that school administrators, fellow teachers, and their professional organizations ought not simply take this problem on solely as a professional issue. They should take it on as a personal issue. A new teacher, oppressed by the vision that she is boring her students to an early grave, does not need someone tripping in with a checklist, but someone who after school will take her out for a cup of tea or a beer, and tell her all the funny, horrible things that happened to her when she was a first-year teacher. Let her know that she, too, went through this dark night of the soul; that she

did learn the ropes finally, and after learning the ropes, she discovered a great profession. What the first-year teacher needs more than the mandatory inservice program is the personal warmth and presence of his or her new colleagues; a place at the lunch table; an invitation to TGIF, the culture club (the meaning of which they may not discover until May!); the inside story on the paperwork (what has to be done, and what can be put aside) and so on. What I am suggesting is that the most effective solution to this professional problem may be the personal attention and friendship of experienced teachers and administrators, rather than simply relying on the institutional program.

Ashley Montague, the British anthropologist, somewhere wrote a line that I think is highly appropriate to the first year of teaching. Montague wrote, "The deepest personal sorrow suffered by human beings consists of the difference between what one was capable of becoming, and what one has, in fact, become." This sorrow is particularly bitter when there is so much that we can do to help the beginning teacher, and so much that we are not doing.

ASSESSMENT FOR TEACHING: AN INITIATIVE FOR THE PROFESSION

Lee S. Shulman

As my work in the Teacher Assessment Project continues, I am often reminded of an old story. A fellow goes to his neighbor and asks for the return of the flawless pot the neighbor borrowed many months before. The neighbor takes offense at the request. "In the first place, I never borrowed your pot," he says. "In the second place, it was already cracked when I got it. And in the third place, I returned it two weeks ago."

When people ask me about the progress we are making on our assessment research, they typically inquire about how long it will take our Stanford research team to finish designing the new national licensing test for teachers. I answer, "In the first place, we're not writing the test. In the second place, it won't be *a* test. In the third place, states have the responsibility for licensure; we're working on voluntary professional certification. And in the fourth place, all those policy decisions will be up to the National Board of Professional

Teaching Standards, not a research team studying alternative strategies for assessing teachers' competence."[1]

Indeed, my colleagues and I are engaged in developing new prototypes of teacher assessment that can serve as working models for the new National Board of Professional Teaching Standards. We are, as it were, stocking the board's pantry with a variety of completed dishes and separate ingredients from which its members will be able to fashion an assessment menu.

More generally, we intend to expand the vision of those who design tests for teachers regarding the full range of possibilities available. For whatever reasons, only two types of assessment are now used for teachers: some kind of multiple-choice examination, whether of basic skills, subject-matter knowledge, or pedagogical understanding; or some form of direct observation of practice, employing what is almost invariably a global scale that ignores differences in context attributable to the subject matter being taught or the age or level of the learners.

Having disabused *Kappan* readers of the most rampant misconceptions regarding our work, some important questions remain: What are we actually doing and to what ends? What are the activities of the teacher assessment research team, and how do they relate to the remarkable range of developments in both the establishment of a national board for teaching and the radical changes in teacher licensing taking place in such states as Connecticut? How might new developments in teacher assessment relate to changes in policies for teacher education and the induction of beginning teachers? What conceptions of both teaching and teacher assessment undergird these developments? Does the world really need a new test for teachers?

Our research program is designed to create prototypes for a new generation of teaching assessments. As part of our assessment strategy, we will be aiming to demonstrate that those teachers who achieve board certification are sufficiently knowledgeable and independent to exercise significant judgment regarding curriculum, instruction, students, and staff development. The work rests on the assumption that approaches to assessment must mirror as accurately as possible the complexity and richness of teaching. It rests on a conception of teaching that differs substantially from those currently employed for such assessments as the NTE (formerly the Na-

1. I must distinguish between the perspectives of our research program and those of the National Board of Professional Teaching Standards. As that new deliberative and policy-making body gathers to consider the many matters to which it must attend, it will draw on many sources of counsel. The work of the Teacher Assessment Project will be one of those sources; it will not be the sole source. Thus, when I articulate the philosophy underlying our research program, I am certainly not speaking on behalf of the national board or the Carnegie Corporation.

tional Teacher Examination) or the teacher observations systems in place in a number of states.

Our work further assumes that an assessment can only be seen as a single aspect of the more general effort to improve education and the work of teachers. Thus we evaluate alternative approaches to teacher assessment by standards that go well beyond the traditional benchmarks of reliability and validity. We ask instead whether a given approach to assessment (if taken seriously) is likely to contribute to needed changes in both the education of teachers and the settings in which they teach.

Let me begin, then, with an account of the conception of assessment that has evolved during the course of our work. I'll describe the model of teaching that underlies our approaches, the actual research and development activities in which we have been engaged, and the policy implications of our work, especially those that apply to individuals and organizations that are regularly involved in the assessment of teachers.

Conception of Assessment

The ideal teaching assessment is unlikely to take the form of a single examination for which a candidate "sits" during a designated period, as is the case with the NTE and its state-level equivalents. Nor is the ideal assessment likely to follow the tripartite design of the National Board of Medical Examiners, which accomplishes its purposes in three "sittings" spaced over a three-year period from the end of the second year of medical school to the completion of the internship.

Instead, it is more prudent to imagine teacher assessment as an ongoing set of at least the following procedures:

- written assessments,
- assessment center exercises,
- documentation of performance during supervised field experiences, and direct observation of practice by trained observers.

These procedures can be aggregated into a coherent body of evidence – kept in a portfolio or some sort of cumulative record – that documents the teaching capacities of each candidate. This portfolio would be submitted for review to representatives of the National Board of Professional Teaching Standards at some time after the candidate had successfully completed the residency requirements. Because both traditional testing and direct

observation are already in widespread use, I will elaborate on the use of performance assessment centers and documentation procedures as additional sources of data for teacher assessment.

Performance assessment centers. Performance assessment centers are becoming more widely used in such professions as business, school administration, emergency medicine, the foreign service, and architecture. A performance assessment uses methods of simulation to represent aspects of the functions to be performed in a given occupation. The candidates come to a center, where each one participates in similar exercises. Unlike traditional tests, in which a candidate responds by selecting an alternative in a multiple-choice test or by writing an essay that describes what one would do under certain circumstances, activities at an assessment center require candidates to respond as they would on the job. In a planning exercise, candidates must plan; in a group problem-solving exercise, candidates deliberate together; in a teaching exercise, they teach (though perhaps to a TV screen, an adult examiner, or a small group of "pupils" who have been hired to participate).

A teaching assessment, for example, might ask candidates to examine several alternative textbooks in their special fields, critically analyzing their accuracy, the perspective they take on the material covered, the kind of pedagogy they represent, their contrast with other instructional materials in the field, their appropriateness for different groups of learners, and the goals to which they are directed. Candidates might then be asked to prepare for their departments or school boards reports on the suitability of the books.

This exercise would provide evidence of each candidate's knowledge of subject matter, knowledge of curriculum, understanding of alternative teaching methods and goals, and appreciation of differences among students. A candidate's writing and speaking abilities (if an oral report is required) and capacity for critical reading and comprehension would also be evident. In addition, the context in which the basic skills of reading, writing, and speaking are assessed would be far more realistic and educationally relevant than in most current assessments.

Another possible assessment exercise would require a candidate to come to the center with a videotape of one or more lessons he or she had taught that seemed particularly successful. The candidate would be asked to present the lesson as an example of his or her own teaching and then engage two examiners in a discussion of the goals of the lesson and their relationship to the goals of the rest of the unit or course, including the choices made in developing the lesson and the alternatives the candidate had considered. In this way, the candidate would be able to introduce teaching material directly from his or her own experience to be examined and discussed at the center.

The examination of a candidate at an assessment center typically lasts for a day or two and can include as many as five or six different exercises in a day.

However, the use of an assessment center, though necessary to improve the current state of teacher testing, will not by itself be sufficient. Some method must be found to document the performance of candidates in their classrooms. Documentation of performance refers to methods for observing and recording a teacher's accomplishments during a supervised residency. We need to document the actual performance of aspiring teachers for two reasons. First, not everything worth knowing can be demonstrated on an assessment. Second, documentation can interact with coaching and support. Thus assessment itself can reinforce training, help socialize beginning and experienced teachers to new collegial roles, and stimulate new configurations of relationships at the school site.

Documentation. An example of documenting performance might be useful. In medical specialties, such as obstetrics and gynecology, examiners have long since realized that no form of standardized examination can establish whether a candidate is competent to perform certain key procedures in the appropriate manner and at the appropriate time. The criterion is one of both quality of performance and prudence of judgment in deciding when to employ a given procedure.

Thus the directors of obstetrical residencies are called on to document and attest to a candidate's successful demonstration of the ability to employ certain procedures correctly and judiciously. Successfully handling such different situations as normal deliveries, breech deliveries, and Caesarian sections cannot be evaluated using pencil and paper or even using the simulations typical of an assessment center. But a full strategy of assessment must provide some grounds for attesting to the fact that a candidate has achieved those objectives.

By the same token, a teaching candidate may have to demonstrate that certain goals have been attained through the testimony of supervisors—be they cooperating teachers or university supervisors during student teaching or be they site-based mentors during an initial period of residency. For example, imagine that the National Board of Professional Teaching Standards stipulates that a teacher must be able to plan, organize, implement, and evaluate lessons involving the use of cooperative small groups in a candidate's teaching field. Fairly traditional assessments can establish whether an individual understands the principles and strategies and can plan accordingly. But the actual completion of a cycle of planning and implementation can only be documented in the field. Moreover, the documentation of such field-based work would be the responsibility of a field-based mentor who would assist the can-

didate in learning to perform to the standard and would then document (*not* merely attest to, using some sort of simple checklist) the achievement in a way that would permit outside reviewers to judge the quality of the performance. The mentor thus serves as both coach and formative evaluator, as supporter of new learning and as collaborator in recording the evidence of satisfactory performance.

Documentation portfolios are likely to include such artifacts as lesson plans, examples of student work with teacher comments, videotapes of teaching, observers' notes, commentaries by mentor teachers, and so on. We envision a set of "items" for mentor teachers to document and attest to, including the accomplishment of important teaching functions, such as teaching via cooperative small groups, organizing and coordinating peer teaching, using debates and simulations, meeting with parents, and so on. Mentors could also observe and attest to various aspects of classroom organization and management. A candidate's sensitivity to issues of student diversity and equity could be documented, along with the ethical quality of a candidate's interactions. Evidence would be continually sought to fill out a candidate's portfolio. Several research problems remain. One will be the means of selecting and training documenters (no adequate precedent for that role currently exists), and another will be establishing the authenticity of the material submitted as part of the portfolio.

Using the four general strategies mentioned about—testing, performance assessment, documentation, and direct observation—the National Board of Professional Teaching Standards would wish to insure that each candidate is liberally educated to an acceptable degree; possesses basic skills of reading, writing, and numeracy; understands the subject areas to be taught in sufficient depth; can engage in the full range of pedagogical reasoning; can successfully teach children of diverse backgrounds and abilities; and understands curriculum, school governance, professional roles and functions, and the ethical imperatives of teaching.

Impact on practice. The nature of these procedures reflects yet another implicit aim of this project with regard to the assessment of teachers. Any proposed reform of teacher assessment for the purpose of certification must contribute to needed changes both in teacher education (preservice and continuing) and in the school as a workplace. *Improvements in assessment alone will not reform the teaching profession.* Thus our criteria for judging the value of a proposed approach to teacher assessment extend well beyond "simple" issues of measurement. We insist on asking whether any new proposal for assessment is likely to contribute to the needed reforms of teacher education, to improvements in teaching conditions, and to needed increases in equitable practices—or whether it might exacerbate existing problems.

The very design of a multiple-source strategy of assessment is likely to improve the performance of traditionally underrepresented groups. The emphasis on performance rather than on a simple paper-and-pencil response; on documentation in the field, where a mentor can work closely with a candidate; and on attempts to develop assessments of interpersonal perceptions, communication skills, and efficacy in the classroom will give all candidates opportunities to demonstrate that they can test as well as teach.

In addition, the various measures can probably be viewed as compensatory. That is, low scores on some measures could be offset by high performance on others, as long as the two assessments pertain to the same domain. For example, a candidate who scores poorly on a written assessment of content knowledge in biology may be able to offset that performance by consistently demonstrating knowledge of the subject matter in the assessment center or in the classroom.

The National Board of Professional Teaching Standards would thus be asked to consider a strategy different from either the "funnel" model employed by such agencies as the U.S. Foreign Service or the initial screening of teaching candidates with basic skills tests before they can enter a teacher education program or take a job. Instead, assessment approaches must permit candidates to continue in the system long enough for compensatory procedures to yield their results. Such strategies are more expensive than current procedures, but the national board will need to consider them in the interests of its full range of goals.

Conception of Teaching

As I stated above, our research program rests on more than a new conception of assessment. Our program (though of course the national board may not necessarily share our views) rests on a set of conceptions of teaching, teacher education, and teacher assessment that we have discussed in some detail in several other publications.[2] The research program centers on a conception of teaching as an activity that is more than behavior, more than the generic skills of pedagogy, and more than can be observed in any single setting.

2. See Lee S. Shulman, "Those Who Understand: Knowledge Growth in Teaching," Educational Researcher, February 1986, pp. 4–14; Lee S. Shulman and Gary Sykes, "A National Board for Teaching?: Toward a Bold Standard," paper commissioned by the Carnegie Forum on Education and the Economy, 1986; Lee S. Shulman, "Knowledge and Teaching: Foundations of the New Reform," Harvard Educational Review, February 1987, pp. 1–22; and Suzanne M. Wilson, Lee S. Shulman, and Anna Richert, " '150 Different Ways' of Knowing: Representations of Knowledge in Teaching," in James Calderhead, ed., Exploring Teacher Thinking (Sussex, U.K.: Holt, Rinehart & Winston, forthcoming).

The key words in our critique of existing forms of teacher assessment are *content, context,* and *cognition.* Most current evaluations of teachers grow out of a heavily behavioral and generic view of teaching. This view draws heavily on the effective-teaching literature, which has tended to be interpreted by policy makers and practitioners as asserting that teaching skills are generic across ages and school subjects. Moreover, this literature has defined teaching skill almost exclusively in terms of observable classroom behavior. The definition of standards and competencies in New Jersey's new "alternate" route to certification reflects this interpretation.

Our research team strongly disputes the sufficiency of this position. We argue that teaching typically occurs with reference to specific bodies of content or specific skills and that modes of teaching are distinctly different for different subject areas. The particular kinds of learners and the character of the setting also influence the kind of instruction that takes place. Finally, we believe that teaching involves reasoning as well as acting; it is an intellectual and imaginative process, not merely a behavioral one.

There are several implications of this view of assessment. First, an adequate assessment can never be confined solely to such generic skills of teaching as classroom management or to such generic areas of knowledge as school law. Instead, most assessments must examine the applications of pedagogy to specific subject areas. Assessments must ask candidates to take account of the contexts in which teaching occurs. These include such matters as the characteristics of the learners and aspects of the community, language, and culture. Finally, an adequate assessment of teaching must not only examine whether a candidate can perform effectively but also assess whether he or she can justify specific actions and explain decisions and judgments.

The last aspect of teaching is particularly germane to the orientation of the Carnegie Task Force on Teaching as a Profession and to the new National Board of Professional Teaching Standards. As last year's report of the Carnegie Commission emphasized, teachers in the future will be expected to be far more self-sufficient than in the past because much of the responsibility for making decisions about pupils, curriculum, and instruction rests at the school and classroom levels. In partnership with school administrators, teachers will need to exhibit leadership and to spend more time helping new teachers learn their craft. The capacity to explain is essential for these roles.

History of the Project

The Teacher Assessment Project began when the Carnegie Task Force on Teaching as a Profession invited Gary Sykes and me to prepare a position paper on the idea of a national board for the teaching profession.

That paper was presented to the task force in late January 1986. It included a technical analysis of the knowledge base of teaching, a description of the ways in which a new assessment of teachers might differ from current approaches, a policy analysis of the possible forms a national board might take, and a research agenda for the development of such an assessment.

At the invitation of the Carnegie Corporation, we submitted a proposal to conduct studies leading to the development and field-testing of two new assessment "prototypes" and an associated developmental protocol. Each prototype was to be a working model of one section of a teacher assessment, based on what a teacher needed to know and know how to do in order to teach a particular topic. The strategy of developing relatively simple working models was based on the premise that, if we could not create a prototype for a given area, we were unlikely to be able to develop a full assessment for the full domain of teaching.

In June 1986 we began a program of research to study three questions: What do teachers need to know and know how to do? How can that knowledge and skill be assessed? And how can a program of assessments be designed that will be adequate to the complexities of teaching, while remaining equitable for all candidates who might apply? Our guiding principle was that any research we could conduct would be of value to the field of education—whether or not a national board ever came into existence. Consequently, our efforts are also directed toward states concerned with the reform of their licensing systems for teachers and toward teacher education programs that wish to consider more deeply their goals, their conceptions of competent teaching, and their approaches to assessing how well their students are doing as teachers.

We selected two domains for our assessment research: elementary arithmetic and secondary social studies. Within those areas, we concentrated on the teaching of equivalent fractions at the elementary level and the teaching of a unit on the American Revolution and the formation of government at the secondary level.

There were several reasons for choosing these two areas. First, we assumed that elementary and secondary teaching present strikingly different challenges. Elementary teachers are generalists; secondary teachers are typically more specialized. Elementary teachers teach the same group of youngsters for an entire day and for an entire year. Secondary teachers will meet with as many as 170 students each day, and they will change courses two or three times a year. These differences suggest that there will be differences in their knowledge, skills, dispositions, and educational orientations.

A second reason for choosing these subject areas is that the field of arithmetic draws on research literature in the behavioral sciences and education that stretches back to the days of E. L. Thorndike in the first decade of this century. Research in the learning and teaching of history has been far less vigorous; most of the writings in the field are hortatory or anecdotal; rarely are they experimental or empirical. Third, arithmetic represents those fields with a clear hierarchical structure of concepts, principles, and problem-solving methods. History, despite its chronological base, is associated with substantial controversy regarding its goals, emphases, and organization.

The particular topics to serve as "cases in point" were carefully selected, as well. We believe that, at about the time that teachers begin to teach fractions, the mathematical intuitions of many elementary teachers begin to fail them. Given our interest in the intersection of subject-matter knowledge and pedagogical skill, the teaching of fractions emerges as a critical area. Like fractions at the elementary level, the American Revolution is a universal topic in the high school curriculum, regardless of the style or orientation of the U.S. history course. Moreover, it provides interesting opportunities for examining the role of the newer forms of social and ethnic history, as well as the interaction of teaching approaches with students' prior knowledge and expectations.

In each case we studied, a number of features characterized the approach we took. These included selecting and completing "wisdom of practice" studies; appointing and convening subject-expert panels; commissioning special papers to inform the work of the group; reviewing the state of the art in performance assessment within other professions; designing, pilot-testing, and field-testing a library of assessment exercises in the designated domains; and continuing analysis of the probable impact of a variety of assessments on minority candidates.

A centerpiece of our first year's work has been the "wisdom of practice" research. This type of research rests on the assumption that experienced and excellent teachers are capable of pedagogical performances that educational theory and research cannot yet explain, much less predict. Therefore, any effort to define standards for teaching and to operationalize them in an assessment must reach beyond the judgments of academic experts. The careful documentation of the ways in which wise practitioners think about their teaching of particular topics and actually engage in the instruction is an indispensable feature of our deliberations about and design of assessments.

The role of the subject-expert panels includes helping to define the nature of standards in their teaching fields, proposing the topics and authors for

commissioned papers, reviewing and commenting on case reports, critiquing drafts of assessment exercises, and eventually taking part in field tests. Expert panels are composed of between eight and ten members and typically include three or four classroom teachers, several specialists in the academic discipline under consideration, and both teacher educators and educational researchers (who could be the same people) who conduct studies in the area under review.

All the exercise development undertaken has been funneled into pilot tests and will eventually find its way into large-scale field tests. Pilot tests of individual exercises have been conducted with teacher candidates and with both new and experienced teachers. We have a teacher advisory board, which includes some 30 elementary and secondary teachers from the San Francisco Bay area who have shown an interest in our work. This board has met regularly to discuss the general course of the project and, more recently, to pilot-test our draft instruments. We use the feedback of board members to modify and refine the design of our instruments.

Everything that we undertake on this project is carefully documented and preserved for subsequent analysis. All materials, including drafts of instruments, commission papers, raw data from the wisdom-of-practice studies, and the results of pilot and field tests as they are completed, are being included in a database that has been designed for the project activities. A study of the processes of test development is being conducted by one member of the project staff. This documentation and study will result in a protocol and manual for test development to be completed by the middle of 1988.

Looking Ahead

The first field test of prototypes took place in August 1987. Forty "candidates" were invited to the Stanford campus in groups of 20 for four days each. They represented a cross section of new teachers, experienced teachers, and a few nonteachers. They included elementary and secondary teachers, teachers of mathematics and social studies, minority and majority teachers, and teachers from urban, suburban, and rural areas.

During the field test we administered the entire library of exercises and carefully observed and recorded participants' responses. All candidates were fully debriefed each day. We also trained judges and assessment observers, and we even hired a group of youngsters to serve as "pupils" during the assessment—a kind of pedagogical repertory company. Records of the field test were preserved on video- and audiotape and in written form. Members of the expert panels and of the new National Board of Professional Teaching Standards itself served as observers, judges, and administrators. So

far, it appears that the conception of assessment that we have articulated is credible with the teaching and scholarly communities. We must now await the analysis of the data from the field tests in order to understand how well our assessment technologies will work and how easily standards can be applied to judgments about specific acts of teaching or to reasoning about teaching.

When the current cycle of research on the elementary mathematics and secondary history/social studies prototypes has been completed, we will turn to a second cycle of research on the assessment of literacy (reading and writing) and of secondary biology. We will then have completed four prototypes – two each at the elementary and secondary levels.

Each assessment prototype includes between 10 and 15 distinct exercises, requiring from 45 minutes to three hours to administer. Each of these prototype exercises can potentially yield both a general, pass/fail judgment and a series of discrete scores in the areas of content, process, skill, and disposition. Some of these exercises may be generalizable to other teaching areas; others will be quite domain-specific. Some exercises will deal with fairly generic teaching skills and understandings; others will focus on a particular subject. Thus a prototype is far more than a single instrument; it is a set of about a dozen exercises designed to assess the content knowledge and pedagogical understandings and skills of candidates as these relate to the teaching of particular topics within particular subject areas.

We anticipate that these prototypes, along with the research we will have completed on both assessment and documentation methods, will provide a starting point for the larger-scale development effort that will be required both by the National Board of Professional Teaching Standards and by other groups concerned with the design of assessments. Our prototypes and the research that helped create them will provide models to enable test development agencies to proceed with the design and deployment of full-scale assessments.

We are also working with the states of California and Connecticut on the development of radically new approaches to defining standards and procedures for licensing teachers. The states can draw on our findings and expertise, as they serve as pilot sites and collaborating investigators and move toward the development of "board-compatible" licensing procedures. These two collaborations are proving to be enormously helpful. For example, Connecticut has pilot-tested with both novice and experienced mathematics teachers exercise ideas stimulated by our colleague Gaea Leinhardt of the University of Pittsburgh. The results of these tests have been of real value to us in our planning. California is now moving in a similar direction, placing

somewhat more emphasis on exploring the uses of documentation of performance during supervised residencies.

Such collaborations not only advance our research efforts but also provide an opportunity for us to study and inform teacher assessment policy at the state level. In addition, they increase the likelihood that the efforts of the national board will be seen as compatible with those of the states. A recent grant from the National Governors' Association to the state department of education in Connecticut is intended to support that state's continuing collaboration with California and to afford opportunities for other states committed to significant redesigns of teacher assessment to join in a consortium. Pat Forgione of Connecticut and Laura Wagner of California are coordinating the consortium.

In all these areas, the research will tread a thin line between recognizing the need to reform the curriculum and improve teaching approaches and the obligation to reflect enough of the status quo to provide a fair opportunity for teachers all over the country to become board-certified. In working with the expert panels during this first year, however, it seems clear that the prototypes will lean toward a reform-oriented conception of teaching. For example, they may emphasize an understanding of the role of technology in teaching or the introduction of such newer topics as social history into the standard curriculum.

This result reflects to some extent the selection of panel members. Most procedures for inviting both academic and professional participants to be members of panels tend to be biased in favor of reform-oriented conceptions of teaching. If the National Board of Professional Teaching Standards selects the members of its test-advisory or test-development committees in the same way, a similar pattern is likely to emerge. I do not mean to suggest, however, that the notions of what kind of reform is needed are in any way uniform among members of a panel. Indeed, the panelists are likely to debate vigorously about which reforms are needed. But they probably will not disagree about whether or not *some* reform is desirable.

A Moral Imperative

Recently we held a three-day meeting to examine the full range of equity issues involved in designing a new set of standards and assessments for teaching. It was especially interesting to review the ways in which institutions with high proportions of minority students were coping with the demands of current standards. In many states, the NTE is used to determine eligibility for state licensure. If a certain proportion of candidates from a teacher preparation program fails to pass the test, the program stands in danger of losing its

state approval. Thus the faculty members involved in teacher preparation programs take the teaching examination very seriously. Some reported that they use the NTE as a curricular blueprint, revising their teacher education programs to conform to the categories and contents of that test and thereby affording their students a better chance of being licensed. They reported that this practice has been successful; the pass rates at institutions that use it have risen dramatically.

Teacher educators are certainly justified in adjusting their curricula to enhance the likelihood that their students will earn the opportunity to practice. But the recognition that educators will necessarily respond in this way to tests for certification places a special burden on those who design such tests and on those who select and use them. These tests must become *tests worth teaching for.* The traditional criteria of reliability and validity are no longer sufficient. As long as assessments drive instruction, assessment designers have a moral obligation to create instruments that correspond to appropriate images of excellent professional preparation and practice. Any assessment that can be prepared for in a way that would not also be valuable educationally for, in the candidates being prepared, is an unacceptable assessment.

Linda Darling-Hammond's incisive critique of the NTE and similar examinations makes clear how inadequate is the match between what these instruments measure and any reasonably adequate conception of how teaching should be represented.[3] Especially when we can predict that any assessment that is taken seriously will have a significant impact on the ways in which teacher educators prepare their students, test developers and users share the burden of demonstrating that their instruments not only filter but inform. To borrow Shirley Malcolm's apt phrase, our goal should be to cultivate rather than merely to weed.

It is clear to me and to members of our research team that a new approach to teacher assessment is needed and needed badly—but not for the reasons normally advanced to justify a "new test." We do not need an examination that will simply screen more finely or even one that will be less biased per se. We *do* need a new form of assessment that will reflect a more enlightened view of teaching. We *do* need a new form of assessment that will inspire teacher educators to aim higher in creating their curricula and designing their programs. We *do* need a new form of assessment that will, in the very process of being implemented through supervised residencies in the schools,

3. Linda Darling-Hammond, "Teaching Knowledge: How Do We Test It?," American Educator, Fall 1986, pp. 18–21, 46–47. It is heartening to note that the leaders of the Educational Testing Service intend to engage in a radical revision of the NTE in the coming five years. I hope that other test developers will follow this example.

introduce new forms of mentoring, collaboration, and collegiality between beginning and experienced teachers.

The success of our new assessment, however, should not be judged solely by the usual criterion of ratios of "hits" to "misses." The true test of the new approaches to assessment that I have outlined here will be whether they contribute to the needed reforms of teaching and teacher education. If our new assessments do not become part of the solution, then they will surely become part of the problem.

THE ROLE OF SCHOOLS IN HELPING CHILDREN AT RISK

Marian Wright-Edelman

Teachers and teacher trainers, after parents and religious leaders, are the network of support that our children need in order to be healthy in the next generation. I am piecing together what I am saying today from four new Children's Defense Fund (CDF) publications and before I begin I want to tell you what they are. One is our new analysis of how the nation is investing in children, and is called A Children's Defense Budget: An Analysis of the FY 1988 Federal Budget and Children. The book will be released at our national conference on adolescent pregnancy prevention from March 11-13. We would like to have more educators participate. We have a publication put out by Harvard University Press called *Families in Peril,* and I hope that that will be one that will give you broader background. The third publication is The Health of America's Children: A Maternal and Child Health Data Book, which we released in February. Finally, I have just finished Adolescent Pregnancy: An Anatomy of a Social Problem in Search of Comprehensive Solutions, the January issue of CDF's Adolescent Pregnancy Prevention Clearing-

house in-use series. But now I do want to discuss the role of the schools in helping children at risk.

I believe that a national catastrophe is in the making. The survival and quality of our children, youths, and families are the single most important determinants of the quality of the national and world future. Yet of the four- and five-year-olds in today's America who will be in the public schools next year, of the potential students and workers in the year 2000, one in four is poor, one in three is nonwhite or Hispanic of whom two in five are poor. One in five is at risk of becoming a teen parent. One in six has no health insurance. One in six lives in a family where neither parent has a job. One in seven is at risk of dropping out of school, and one in two has a mother working outside the home but only a minority receive quality child care. Their nurturing unit, the family, is impaired by extraordinary change and economic instability. Of every one hundred children born today, twenty will be born out of wedlock. Twelve will be born to parents who will divorce before their children reach eighteen. Six will be born to parents who separate before their children reach adulthood. Four will be born to families in which one parent will die before the child reaches eighteen. Forty will live in a female-headed household before adulthood.

Poverty and related ills also affect millions of families. Of every one hundred children born today in America, thirteen will be born to a teenage mother. Fifteen will be born into a household where no parent is employed. Fifteen will be born into a household with a working parent earning a below-poverty wage. Twenty-five will be on welfare at some point before adulthood. No moral or sensible nation can dare to write off such a significant portion of its human assets. To ignore these facts is to jeopardize America's future and undermine the competitiveness and productivity of our economy in the twenty-first century.

Young people between the ages of 16 and 24 comprised 27% of our working age population in 1978. They will constitute only 19% by 2005. One in three of our new workers will be minority. As the number of young workers steadily declines, business and industry will be forced to rely upon workers and potential workers in whom we have traditionally failed to invest. Our future prosperity now depends in large part upon workers and potential workers whom we have not educated well, who are disproportionately poor, who are disproportionately minority, and who are disproportionately under-educated and untrained.

I think that the Federal budget deficit and the trade deficit both pale in comparison to this human-development deficit and the national spiritual deficit that permits it. A prime challenge for the next American decade is the

protection of all of our children from death by arms, want, and neglect. Between now and the year 2000, the nation must mount a carefully conceived comprehensive human investment effort in all our young and in all our families to overcome the debilitating effects of decades of poverty, racial discrimination, neglect, and eroding employment and family wage base. Taxes draw from the weak for the military and the wealthy. We must begin with a national commitment to ensure that every child has basic health, nutrition, and early childhood services and thus has the capacity and opportunity to learn well and to develop strong basic academic skills.

I have been very pleased that some educators are realizing that they have a self-interest in seeing that prenatal care and adequate nutrition is provided to younger children, because those are the children who are going to come into your classrooms not prepared to learn. I am hoping that educators will begin to move outside the narrow little boxes of what they view as their role, and understand that they must build a pool of healthy young people whom you can teach properly when they do show up at your doorstep. The level of a young person's basic academic skills has a powerful effect on his or her prospects for future achievement, teenage parenthood, and eventual self-sufficiency.

There is a strong relationship between basic skill levels, teen parenthood, and poverty. As you know, CDF and I spend much of our time talking about teenage pregnancy prevention, which I think is as much your business as it is my business. I want to show you that the most important thing that we can do to prevent teenage pregnancy is to give young people sound, basic skills. The schools are central to how we view effective strategies to prevent teen parenthood. In the January report I mentioned, you play a very prominent part.

According to data from the National Longitudinal Survey of Young Americans, youths with very poor reading skills and math skills, those who are in the bottom fifth relative to their peers, are far more likely to become parents at an early age than those with average basic skills. Teens who by fourteen or fifteen have weak basic skills are five times more likely to become mothers before sixteen than those with average basic skills. Young women who by seventeen or eighteen have weak basic skills are two-and-a-half times more likely to become mothers before they are twenty than those with average basic skills. Boys who by seventeen or eighteen have very weak basic skills are three times as likely to become fathers before twenty than those with average basic skills.

By the time young people have reached the end of their teenage years, poor basic academic skills sharply increase the likelihood that they will face a

range of problems in attempting to make the transition to adulthood. Those who by eighteen have the weakest reading and math when compared with those with above average basic skills are eight times more likely to bear children out of wedlock, seven times more likely to drop out of school before graduation, four times more likely to be out of school and out of work, and four times more likely to be forced to turn to public welfare for income support.

Growing up in a poor family dramatically increases a young person's chances of ending up with weak basic skills. Nearly half of all poor youths have reading and math skills that place them in the bottom fifth of the basic skills distribution, and more than three-fourths of all poor youths have below-average basic skills. The combination of poverty and weak basic skills accounts for virtually all of the racial disparity in teen childbearing rates.

The country has traditionally viewed teen pregnancy as just a black problem. We now know that young women between sixteen and nineteen with below-average basic skills who live in poor families, whether white, black, or Hispanic, are six times more likely to have children than young women with above-average basic skills residing in non-poor white households. And there is almost no difference in pregnancy rates between whites, blacks, and Hispanics. Fewer than one in twenty young women with above-average basic skills and above-average income has given birth to a child, but more than one in five young women with below-average basic skills and below-poverty incomes have given birth to a child.

If we are serious as a nation about preventing teenage pregnancy, infant mortality, welfare dependency, unemployment, and bolstering national productivity, we must now invest comprehensively in upgrading the basic skills of all children. To begin, we will increase public productivity. A UCLA professor estimated in 1985 that the total lifetime earnings loss for dropouts in the high school class of 1981 alone will be a staggering $228 billion, with an approximate tax revenue loss of $68 billion. If we are going to regain these lost billions we must begin to work together on a comprehensive ban on child poverty as well as on the arms race that is draining the daily life blood of the young and the needy. Dorothy Day warned years ago that we are quite literally a nation which is in the process of committing suicide in the hopes that the Russians will not be able to murder us. I think it is time for us to listen to her.

I want to explain why we all have a self-interest—you as educators, parents, religious leaders—in preventing teen pregnancy. We cannot work on everything. We work on nutrition and health and early childhood development. But as we are all attempting to provide a basic level of decency in every family, the place where we have decided to place the priority of intervening is

preventing teen pregnancy. I think you are critical to this task but I also think that schools have seen that it is not their business to be involved in issues like this.

There are nine compelling moral, human, economic, and self-interest reasons why every one of us must care and work to prevent epidemic and premature sexual activity, pregnancy, abortion, and births among teens. We are talking about two generations of children. I must say I am having great difficulty trying to figure out how you get fourteen- and fifteen-year-old mothers and their babies up to some level of involvement in the mainstream. How do you keep that mother in school and how do you get a hold of those babies who, if they are neglected by the time they get to Head Start, which serves only one in five, by the time they reach you, are already so far behind? So bear in mind as we think about this problem, we are talking about two generations of children that have severe implications for not only the community but also for you as educators.

1. The first reason is that teen pregnancy is the major contributor to, and consequence of, the child and family poverty that victimizes thirteen million or one out of every five American children. One out of every two black babies born today is being born poor. One out of two children in a female-headed household is poor. If that household is headed by a mother under twenty-five, three out of four of those children are poor. Even when teen pregnancy results in marriage, young, two-parent families are almost three times as likely to be poor as those with parents twenty-five to forty-four years of age. Young parents are having a hard time supporting their children above the poverty line.

2. The second reason is that teen pregnancy affects everybody's family, community, neighborhood, and region. Like nuclear proliferation, AIDS, sexually transmitted diseases, and drugs, teen pregnancy is becoming an "equal opportunity employer," not segregated by race or class or gender or neighborhood or region. About a million teen girls get pregnant every year and they are everybody's daughter and granddaughter, and neighbor's child, and they were impregnated by everybody's sons, who are the often forgotten, excused, or winked-at half of this social tragedy. You as educators and education trainers and all of us as parents have got to start talking to our boys as well as our girls and to stop telling our girls to be chaste, while encouraging our boys to "score."

Teen pregnancy is not just an urban big city problem. The largest numbers of out-of-wedlock teen births are born in what I call the Southern Baptist states in southern areas and rural areas. It is not just a black problem. While the black teen pregnancy rates are going down, in fact birth

rates among black women of all ages are going down, while white rates are going up. White, out-of-wedlock teen births are going up. The black community knows it has a problem. The white community has to discover that it also has a problem.

Over a half million teen girls have babies every year. That is about the equivalent of the population of Atlanta. The majority, almost 350,000 of those half-million babies, are white. Again, the black teens are much more likely to get pregnant because they are disproportionately poor. A black teen is five times as likely as a white teen to become an unwed parent. I want to reemphasize however that the black community is having fewer babies. The tragedy and the problem in the black community is not that we are having more babies. It is that more and more of those babies are being born out of wedlock, and the reason they are being born out of wedlock is because black men do not have the capacity, in increasing numbers, to support black family formation; so, the core of the black family crisis lies with the black economic and training needs of black males.

In the white community the problem is different, because white women are having more babies and having more of them as teens and having more of them out of wedlock. Hispanic patterns are complicated: the Puerto Rican patterns are more like the black patterns; and the Mexican-American patterns are more like the white patterns.

3. The third reason we have got to prevent teen pregnancy is because it is a significant factor in the high numbers of low birth-weight babies which increases the likelihood of birth defects, which in turn increases the pressure on schools to provide special education services.

4. The United States is among the highest in the industrialized world of the number of low birth-weight babies. Low birth weight in turn not only contributes to birth defects, but also contributes to high infant mortality rates which is the fourth reason we must all work on teen pregnancy; it contributes disproportionately to what I consider to be shamefully high American infant-mortality rates. Our new data book shows that America has dropped since 1950-55 from a tie for sixth place among our industrialized colleagues to a tie for last place. If we want to try to learn how to keep our babies alive, one way in which we can intervene is to prevent young mothers from getting pregnant too soon.

The other thing I think is important to mention about teen pregnancy is that it contributes very much to the growing problem of sexually transmitted diseases. Teens fifteen to nineteen have the highest overall rate of sexually transmitted diseases, about two to three times higher than for individuals over

twenty. Obviously, we are all deeply concerned about AIDS. I also want to mention chlamydia, which is a sexually transmitted disease that I did not know about until I got involved on teen pregnancy. An estimated one million teens suffer from chlamydia infections each year; it is the most common cause of infant pneumonia, and pneumonia is the leading cause of infant death. Teens again are a disproportionate risk for AIDS. By 1991 the Centers for Disease Control estimate that three thousand cases of AIDS will have been diagnosed in infants and children. Minority populations, particularly black and Hispanic populations, are at an increased risk of AIDS. We applaud Surgeon General Koop's effort to talk about viable sexual education as a way not only of preventing AIDS, we think it will also help prevent teen pregnancy. Perhaps AIDS will do for us what a million pregnancies each year have not.

5. Teen pregnancy contributes to large numbers of abortions that divide the nation and paralyze thoughtful action and needed remedies. Forty-one percent of pregnant teens between fifteen and nineteen years old obtain abortions. I do not believe that pregnancy, abortion, or birth are desirable options for teen girls, and those of us who are opposed to abortion have a very strong self-interest in working together to prevent premature sexual activity as well as pregnancy so that that is not an option that young people have to face.

6. The sixth reason we must care is that teen parenthood contributes to long-term welfare dependency. While there is no evidence that welfare causes young women to give birth, it is clear that this is the group that is most likely to remain on welfare once they get there, and that is related to low basic skills and their inability to earn a living. So if we are serious about cutting down on welfare dependents, let us zero in on this problem.

7. The seventh reason is that teen pregnancy adds about $1.3 billion to our tax costs annually, and the parents pay the other two-thirds. You've seen the figure $16.5 billion, which is the total cost that the American taxpayers pay for welfare and medicaid for those mothers of all ages who are dependent on welfare and medicaid who had their first child as a teen.

8. The eighth reason is that teen pregnancy is the largest single cause of school dropout among girls and the major cause of school dropout among males. Each year at least 40,000 teen girls drop out of school because of pregnancy. Sixty-one percent of all teens who have had babies do not complete high school. The ones I worry about most are those younger and younger teens who are getting pregnant, 20% of whom have not even completed the ninth grade. I find it very hard to figure out how to deal with these younger girls, a third of whom get pregnant a second time within three years. Again, the schools must play a basic role in trying to keep them in school. The

first thing they can do is try keeping decent dropout data. We do not have good dropout data by reason, and you cannot begin to provide remedies if you do not know why your children are leaving school. But it is an issue that you are going to have to be concerned with.

9. and 10. The last two reasons, is that you know it is much more serious today to have a baby as a teen than it used to be when you had a baby as a teen and you could get married. Your husband could work on the farm, and you could go off to the army. Today unskilled workers are not in great supply and there is not the same capacity to form families. That is why you are seeing more and more young girls trying to raise families alone; in this society unskilled women just cannot make it. If we are serious about poverty prevention, we are all going to have to figure out what we do.

What are the main barriers to preventing teen pregnancy? I want to run through them very quickly, and then I want to talk about the things that schools can do.

1. The first barrier I think that we need to get out of the way is to stop looking at this as a uniform problem. We must disaggregate it. Teen pregnancy is not a single problem. It is a different problem in the black community from the white community, and we need to disaggregate it by its impact on different groups.

2. The second is we need not look for single solutions. This is a multidimensional problem that is going to require long-term and comprehensive solutions. In our society we tend to think that we can find answers in fifteen minutes. That thinking will not work – this is a long-haul struggle.

3. The third barrier is our capacity to be paralyzed by single-issue minorities, even when a majority really supports certain remedies. Sex education or family-life education is supported by the American public, but a single-issue minority tends to stymie action. There are a range of things we *can* do. In trying to keep a very broad base coalition of pro-choice and anti-choice people together, I have emphasized that the most important things schools can do is not *sex* education, but *good* education. Finding ways to keep young people learning, is as important as providing decent family-life education.

4. The fourth barrier is the identification of teen pregnancy prevention efforts with the abortion issue. We do not take a position on abortion at CDF, and we have been trying to emphasize that there is much that can be done to prevent premature sexual activity and pregnancy that has nothing to do with abortion. We need to give our young people hope.

5. The fifth barrier has been that we are very careless in our rhetoric and our analysis, and we use a lot of terms that tend to divide and polarize carelessly. You know abortion is not the same as family planning. Family planning is not the same as genocide. It does not tell you not to have children, it tells you *when* to have children. Family planning is not the same as family-life education. It is very important that we be careful in our tone and be aware of the conflicting values and try to begin to build coalitions for specific end results which we can accomplish.

6. The sixth barrier is the identification of teen pregnancy as an underclass or welfare or black issue. It is very important that we keep in the public mind that a majority of the girls that get pregnant every year are white, and many of them are middle class.

7. The seventh barrier is our tendency to see teenage pregnancy as just a female problem and not a male problem. We must involve the boys if we are going to have a viable solution to this issue. Coming up with a male message has been very difficult for us. We have a media campaign in process, in which we have been telling young women about the consequences of pregnancy. I do not know how you can deal with the consequences of pregnancy for young men until we change the signals in the culture. We will have to do that, but I hope that you will bear boys in mind as equal partners.

8. Barrier eight is again the quick-fix mentality of many of our media and political leaders, and I am pleased that many of the broad coalition of groups that are now working on teen pregnancy prevention understand that it will take a very long time.

9. I want to mention plain old adult hypocrisy, double standards, and confused values because we expect our children somehow to be different from what we are. I would just remind us all that two-thirds of all out-of-wedlock births are for adult women over twenty-one, and many of our young women and men are doing the things that they see us doing. We tell them that they should be chaste, and yet we tolerate, as adults, messages from the media that say that sex is bliss without consequence. We tell them to be something, and then we glorify in *People* Magazine the Farrah Fawcett-Majors and the Jessica Langs. We have to come to grips with the fact that adults do not know what they want to say to children about sex, and children tend to do what we do, not what we say. We will have to deal with our own values and how we can communicate something that is consistent and good to our young people.

Last is what you can do in school. Obviously I have talked about basic skills. In this, you are critically important. You can establish procedures for

identifying children who are falling behind in elementary and middle schools and focus expanded remedial and compensatory education programs on such children. You can also work with us to deal with early education, because by the time many of these young children get into school it is too late. You ought to be in coalitions working to expand Head Start and preschool and early education projects in every state. But again, you can do a better job in identifying children at risk early and doing something about it so that they do not just fall further and further behind.

Second, you can strengthen your dropout prevention activities at the high school level, including proven models which combine self-paced remedial instruction, vocational preparation, and limited work experience.

Third, you need to reach out and launch attempts to involve parents and community groups in collaborative efforts to address the special needs of disadvantaged children.

Fourth, you need to examine and encourage those you train to reexamine school policies and curricula related to sexuality education, and build community support for broader initiatives which include health education and family-life education such as planning and decision-making skills.

Fifth, you need to develop strategies for boosting college enrollments among economically disadvantaged students, including more comprehensive counseling and guidance programs to make poor and minority youth more aware of post-secondary opportunities. But you also must help build a new pool of healthy young people who can go up through your schools and become the teachers of tomorrow.

The sixth thing you can do is to undertake a review of unmet health needs within your student population and attempt to stimulate community-wide examination, the most effective means to ensure access to health services for poor and minority teenagers.

Seventh, sponsor opportunities for community service and have some examples of community service such as cross-age tutoring programs within the school or volunteer placements with community agencies to bolster students' sense of responsibility and self-worth. The key to much of this is self-esteem. Children need to feel good about themselves and they need to have a variety of ways to feel good about themselves. The key contraceptive, we think, is hope.

The eighth thing you can do is to work with youth-serving organizations in the community to establish and expand recreational and social

programs to poor and minority youth with the goal of bolstering self-esteem. As a middle-class mother I tell you I am so grateful for soccer and football and basketball and baseball. My children are so tired by the time they come home at the end of the day I hope they do not have any energy left to get in trouble. The poor children need the same thing that middle-class children do. All of us middle-class parents have lots of bribes to keep our children out of trouble. Self-limiting acts are not the kind of things where you can say, "Just say No." Though we ought to tell them to say No, we must put something better in place. And schools are going to have to open up and be used for recreation activities; children just do not have anything to do in many of our communities, and that is a terrible indictment. We need to talk about how we can open up these schools in the mornings and on weekends and in the summers and not have those children lose what they have gotten in the regular academic year in the summer. We need to see schools as community institutions in the broadest way and to give young people a way to stay off the street and be constructively involved. They ought to be able to be at school beyond education hours and to be at church; we have got to find a way to reinvolve them in adult life.

And the last thing we must have through schools is the institution of comprehensive school-to-work transition programs, incorporation with business leaders and youth employment agencies which provide summer jobs for disadvantaged youth and employment guarantees when possible for high school graduates.

As I end, I hope that each of us can recommit ourselves to being a persistent "flea" for poor children, because they are part of our national future and we all have a self-interest in that. I know it is often very discouraging in the context of the budget deficits these days, but again, I think we can begin by believing in something deeply to fight long and strong, and there is simply nothing more important that we can be lobbying our political leaders for.

I am reminded everyday of the story of my role model, Sojourner Truth, who talked about slavery when she was a woman who had no rights. She never gave up fighting for justice. My favorite story, which I think keeps me going sometimes, occurred one day when she was speaking out against slavery (when it was really hard to do that). She was snapped at by an old white man who stood up in the audience, and said he did not care any more for her antislavery talk than an old flea. She snapped back at him and said, "That's all right, the Lord willing, I'm going to keep you scratching." I think it is important for every single educator to see themselves as a flea for children. Enough fleas, biting strategically, can make even the biggest dog uncomfortable.

I am convinced that the country is in a cycle now where the pendulum is coming back our way and that the issue of debate is going to be poor children and poor families. I do hope that educators will be in there on the positive side as the pendulum swings back so that we can put into place the kind of floor of national decency that every one of our children needs. But it also must start in the families; but after families, you are the single, most important activists as to whether poor children are going to have a future. I look forward to working with you in a massive flea corps for children so that we can change these disgraceful facts that I have shared today.

EDUCATIONAL EQUITY: WHAT DOES THE FUTURE HOLD? SIX EQUITY STEPS

Asa G. Hilliard, III

Keynote speaker William Winter, former Governor of Mississippi, told the participants at the Southern Education Foundation's Fourth Annual Continuing Conference, November 1986, that education may be the most vital factor in the future of the South. "The time has come to do whatever is necessary to break this cycle of educational neglect based on misplaced priorities," Winter said. "I do not believe that the South can stand much less achieve its maximum potential if we are permanently divided into two groups of people, one thriving, prospering, enjoying the good life that comes from quality education and social privilege – and the other struggling to survive, locked into an existence limited by ignorance, poverty, and misery."

In spite of the critical nature of the equity problem in education today, I still write with a sense of hope. It is a sense of hope that is born out of my personal experience over the years with AACTE. For example, I was a board member of AACTE when Dr. James Kelley, assisted by the late Richard James, led the appointed group that produced the classic "No One Model American" statement of equity principles, later to be adopted by the Board of

Directors. I served on the task force that met in California to develop multicultural standards for the accreditation of teacher education programs, an effort that went much farther than I believed it would. Staff members such as Donna Gollnick established clearinghouse functions for multicultural materials and have published materials on the topic. And of course, David Imig with his quiet, courageous, and excellent leadership, has led the organization toward even more concrete steps such as active presence at equity conferences and stimulating invitational meetings hosted by AACTE for meetings on equity in teacher testing. This action is consistent with his lifelong commitment to equity and excellence. When we met first in Africa, in Liberia, he was a key factor there in the development of many successful educational programs. Over the years, former AACTE Executive Director Edward Pomeroy and several presidents and boards of directors have sought to guarantee greater ethnic and gender representation among the leadership of AACTE.

It is these and many other experiences, even in the face of the resistance from some of our institutions to suggestions for significant equity efforts, that leaves me with a hope that true equity-oriented leadership can make significant differences in the lives of our children and our people in general.

But as meaningful as our record has been in the past, we cannot take the time to glory in it. We cannot do this simply because the job that we have to do is far from finished. Moreover, there are ominous signs that there has been and continues to be a wholesale slippage that threatens to yield results that will be devastating to low income minority cultural groups. These groups have lost ground and are in imminent danger of losing a great deal more.

I will now call attention to the symptoms of our problem that illustrate its depth, persistence, pervasiveness, and its camouflage. I shall provide a view of the contribution of teacher education to the creation of the problem. Finally, I shall make some specific recommendations for action that teacher educators, led by AACTE, can take to insure that educational equity becomes the wave of the future.

First, let me say a few words about what I mean by educational equity: I mean that the outcomes of the educational process should be such that all Americans achieve what we now believe falsely to be attainable only by an elite. For example, foreign language fluency, competency in mathematics at the level of calculus, competency in general science, competency in written and verbal English expression, competency in critical thinking, aesthetic appreciation, and so forth are criterion levels of academic achievement that are well within reach of all our children in the public and private schools. Many

truly gifted students may do even more than this. Further, every student can and must be aware of his or her own people's place in the creative development of human culture from ancient times to the present. In other words, an equitable education is provided when we do whatever is necessary to insure that all of our children possess appropriate high-level competencies, critical awareness, cultural perspectives, and preparation for enhancing their lives through appropriate participation in the aesthetic, economic, and political life of their communities.

Needless to say, there are those among even us who doubt the possibility that these goals are within reach of the masses of our people. Some even declare flatly that it is impossible to reach such goals. As will be shown, it is among such believers that we find the source of ideas and practices in teacher education itself that lead to the actual production of structures and practices that generate inequity. We cannot cure inequity in the general society when inequity is ingrained in our own practice. This means that we must embrace a set of ideas that lead to equity in teacher education.

It should not require proof here that the outcomes of education are vastly different for different racial, language, economic, and gender groups in this nation. Start with any statistic; look at dropouts, suspensions, and expulsions; look at academic achievement indices of any kind; look at the patterns of coursework completed by high school graduates; look at the cultural retardation of all our high school graduates, minority or majority, even the elite ones. But most especially look at the ignorance of and alienation from their natal culture experienced by the millions of children who are on the bottom economically, socially, and politically, Many graduate from school with no knowledge of themselves.

It should also require little proof here that the *processes* of education are vastly different among the various racial language, economic, and gender groups in the nation. Consider the scandalous disproportionate placement of students in special education categories. Look at the exposure of special education students to low-level demands that condemn millions of students to miss exposure to higher levels of educational activity. Look at the meager attempts nationally to pluralize the standard European centered curriculum so that it conforms to the truth of all human experience, rather than reflecting a glorification of the narrow, parochial cultural experiences of dominant groups. Look at the largest "exodus" in human history. It was not the half-million Hebrews who crossed the Red Sea; it was the millions of European Americans who abandoned the public schools after school desegregation, changing drastically the financial base for education in the schools that they left as they went to the private schools, suburban public schools, and even to the "Christian Academies." Look at the wholesale decimation of the ranks of

African Americans who were school principals before desegregation. Look at the present wholesale decimation of the ranks of African American teachers. A 25% reduction in the last five years. These teachers and administrators not only served in the public schools, but were natural key leaders of socialization in the communities from which they came. Look at the crowding of urban schools and the high rate of turnover of professional staff in schools in minority and poverty neighborhoods. Look at the library and media holdings and note the chasm that separates those holdings from the reality of the cultural experiences of students who use those libraries.

These process inequities reflect something that is even more deeply rooted. We must become more aware of the persistence of racism and bigotry in the general culture. Only within the last few months have "Howard Beach" and "Forsyth County" become international "cusswords." And yet the attitudes and behaviors expressed in those locations are not new. Neither are they unique. Numerous other counties bordering major metropolitan areas are like these, areas such as the Philadelphia, Chicago, and Detroit suburbs.

In the past, some have said that racism produced white flight, causing many of these suburbs to be built. But the racism and bigotry problem is broader than that. National reports on the persistence everywhere of widespread housing discrimination are depressing. There is much much more.

The point is that those who discriminate and those who tolerate it are often graduates of our schools. We have had our chance to teach equity lessons, to make them a priority. The question is, what is our responsibility and obligation to insure that healthy attitudes develop in all our students? Do educators know how to do this? How is it reflected in our practice?

Time will not permit a full documentation of what I have just said or similar things that I will not take the time to say. However, the point that I am making is that neither input nor outcomes are equitable for the children of the United States at this time, nor have they ever been. If we are to hold students responsible for appropriate high-level standards on the output end, then we must hold society and the profession responsible for equity at the input end. It is at this end that I will focus the remainder of my remarks.

So far, I have talked most about the public schools. However, I have done so mainly because the largest number of our graduates work there. Therefore, we have some responsibility for their successes or for their failures. Nevertheless, I must say also that the teacher education changes that are required are required for all teachers, in public or private schools. Just as physicians are required to get a license, no matter what the source of funding

for their practice, competency assurance for teachers, public or private, is in the public interest as well.

We have just endured more than a decade of school reform reports. They now number in the hundreds. They include reports that tell us what to do in teacher education. Few of these reports have addressed the equity issue in any meaningful way. In fact, many of us have suspected that at least some of the major reform reports were stimulated by anti-equity sentiments. Some educators have openly suggested that equity efforts such as those embarked upon in the 1960's were mainly responsible for the decline in the numbers of students who meet standards of excellence. Educating a broader, more heterogeneous, base of the population, curriculum changes, and other efforts have been cited as the source of lowered performance outcomes for the nation. To some educators the very word "excellence" was more a strike against the equity movement than an affirmation of new high quality goals. It is as if we do not believe that all children can learn. In fact, equity in education *is* excellence in education. You simply cannot have one without the other. If capable students do not achieve, then we have missed the mark.

The reform reports on teacher education, like those directed at the public schools, were not driven in any evident way by equity sensitivity. While we must look at any attempt to improve teacher education as welcome, we must be cautious in giving premature praise to those efforts. If the outcomes of teacher education reform efforts are equity and excellence for students who are taught by teachers that we educate, then we will know that the reforms are correct. In this I agree with the Southern Regional Education Board (1986) which said:

> Learning outcomes should be the primary goal of any changes. Greater professionalism would surely follow.
>
> There are of course no data on whether the programs would generate substantially improved learning since the programs envisioned in the proposals are yet to be designed.
>
> Some fifty percent of the teachers in the United States now hold a masters degree, primarily in education. There is no evidence that this mass upgrading of credentials has improved student learning. (SREB, 1986, p. 5, Regional Spotlight.)

If this is true, as I believe that it is, then change is not necessarily progress.

The Carnegie forum on Education and the Economy report in 1986, *A Nation Prepared,* The Holmes Group report in 1986, *Tomorrow's Teachers,*

and the National Commission on Excellence in Teacher Education report in 1985, *A Call for Change in Teacher Education,* all had one thing in common. They were not reports that dealt with the nature of teacher education. These reports spoke about admission to "it" (teacher education) in terms of "standards," usually meaning test scores and paper-and-pencil tests. They spoke about having more of "it" and more credentials for "it," e.g., five years instead of four, more years of liberal arts and the M.A.T. degree. They spoke of having faculty model "it" and internships in "it," supervised by lead teachers who, presumably, were good at "it." What they failed to do was to describe and critique "it."

I can support the principles described in many of the teacher education proposals, such as more time for teacher preparation and the need for academic majors. California had most of them in place years ago. However, the root equity issues still remain to be addressed. To rush ahead, especially with the full knowledge of what these efforts may do to Black Colleges that have educated most African American teachers, and which depend in large measure on a large teacher education enrollment for their survival, or what these efforts will do to the pool of minority teachers in general, is to face the possibility of producing greater inequity in teacher education and in the K–12 schools.

Let us take a closer look at the "it" from an equity and excellence perspective. This will help us to see what has been missed and what we can do about it.

We can identify six steps to equity, as follows:

1. *The Admission of Minorities to Higher Education and to Teacher Education.* The ethnic diversity of the teaching faculty is a pedagogical necessity and is not merely a matter of fair play in the labor market. There are at least two major pedagogical reasons for us to insure that there is an ethnically diverse teacher corps. First, the existence of ethnic diversity is itself an equity lesson for students who must be taught respect for and understanding of people from groups other than their own. Second, it is a pedagogical necessity that all children have access to role models, especially among their teachers. A monoethnic teacher corps is a silent teacher of negative lessons.

There is a growing threat to the diversity of our national body of teachers. The numbers of African and Hispanic teachers are being reduced unnecessarily. Urgent action is needed to correct this problem. No single tool is more widely used, and no single tool has had a more devastating effect on certain minority cultural groups, than the standardized paper-and-pencil test

for admission. The impact of these tests on education decision-making is well known. What is not well known is that the scores of thousands of minority group members who now fail can be raised relatively quickly and easily if two simple steps are taken. First, high-quality coaching, which is widely available to many white students, can be made available to minorities as well. Second, high-quality developmental studies programs can, within a year or less, provide the college level skills that high schools failed to provide for thousands of students.

While no responsible educator would argue that any student be permitted to exit our institutions who does not meet appropriate standards, we do have a moral and professional obligation to admit students who can learn, and to remedy their deficiencies where it is in our power to do so. Indeed, if we are the excellent teacher educators that we say that we are, then we should be able to be those professor models called for in the reports, by providing remediation that works to these capable students who have missed their opportunities. Only by taking such steps can we break the vicious cycle that destines able learners to the depths of poverty and powerlessness.

Our first equity step in teacher education can be to do what we are able to do to assure that there is an equitable balance in the pool of trained teachers.

2. *The Liberal Arts Curriculum.* I have long believed that a solid liberal arts education must be the foundation upon which to build a solid professional education program. However, from an equity and excellence perspective, there is much to be desired in the content of traditional liberal arts curricula. Even two decades after the consciousness raising decade of the 1960's, the basic university-level liberal arts curriculum remains largely Eurocentric, and therefore parochial and untouched. Liberal arts subjects such as mathematics, humanities, sciences, and social sciences are global subjects. There is at present little in them that liberates the students who take these subject from racism, Eurocentrism, sexism, and other forms of anti-democratic thought. It will take a conscious, sustained, deliberate effort to correct centuries of ethnic bias in our general curricula.

> Ideologies are the basic stuff of critical pedagogy. On the one hand, critical pedagogues must help subordinated groups to deconstruct dominant ideologies. This involves systematic demonstration of how the ways of seeing the world that currently prevails in our major educating institutions (families, mass media, and schools) are partial representations of social reality that generally serve the interests of upper class, male, white, and middle-aged social groups, while they simultaneous-

> ly frame, fragment, and distort the perceptions and concerns of more subordinated groups. On the other hand, critical pedagogues must facilitate the identification and development of the interests of subordinated groups in the form of alternative ideologies that resonate popular aspirations more genuinely and make visible preferred images of society that are more participatory and liberating of the potential of all people. Both compelling criticism of current dominant ideologies and clear expression of more universally based alternative ideologies are vital ingredients for sustaining any movement to fundamental educational and social change. (Livingston, 1987.)

A personal example, may help to clarify what I mean. I had completed all of my formal education before I began to learn about the development of human civilization in Ancient Africa by native Africans in the great Nile Valley, and the great influence of this African classical civilization on other parts of the world. Especially concealed in my formal education was the seminal role that Africa played in influencing the development of civilization in Europe from the time of Homer, through the Greeks and Romans and up to 1492. This influence does not appear in our liberal arts content. For example, Dr. John Pappademos, Professor of Physics at the University of Illinois in Chicago did a survey of currently used high school and college physics textbooks. According to Dr. Pappademos,

> A whole continent (Africa) is deleted from the history of physics. In all 17 books surveyed, not once is a scientific discovery or discoverer identified as being of African origin. No Black scientist is pictured in any of the books, nor is a single Black scientist credited with any contribution. (Adams, 1987)

Africans and African Americans have actually made fundamental contributions to physics and other sciences and mathematics. Time will not permit me to detail these contributions here. For the interested person, Dr. Ivan Van Sertima has edited a special issue of the *Journal of African Civilization: Blacks in Sciences, Ancient and Modern.* Suffice it to say here, that present teaching does not reflect the real world of science.

The irony of this whole matter is that what we call the liberal arts curriculum is itself derived directly from the African liberal arts curriculum in the Ancient Nile Valley mysteries system of Kmt (Egypt). Surely no competent academic treatment of the liberal arts can leave out the origin of those liberal arts.

While professional education faculty are not, in the main, responsible for general and liberal arts education, there is a responsibility to advocate for a curriculum that is fair, truthful, and nonparochial. Otherwise we will play a role in the perpetuation of inequity.

Our second equity step in teacher education is to lobby for an appropriate, representative, and truthful liberal arts curriculum.

3. *The Teacher Education Curriculum: A Way of Thinking.* Many things can be said about the content of teacher education. However, from an equity perspective I am concerned about what we teach or fail to teach in our courses in educational psychology, growth and development, history, philosophy, sociology, etc. Much of what we have taught in the past has supported doctrines of racial superiority or inferiority of certain groups. For example, Arthur Jensen has taught that blacks and browns are inferior to whites, based on the results of IQ test scores. He is largely unrebutted by leaders in our profession in our academic publications. He was joined in this view recently by professors Darrel Bok and Elsie Moore of the University of Chicago. They provided an analysis of Defense Department data on Army classification test scores. In headlines all over America, the interpretation of these data was that blacks and browns were genetically inferior to whites. Just last year, sociologists Linda Gottfredson at the University of Delaware and her husband Robert Gordon at Johns Hopkins University received widespread publicity for essentially the same type of work. In the current issue of the American Psychological Association Monitor they are given wider publicity. Then, in the present issue of the American Psychological Association Monitor two more professors are saying essentially the same thing. In addition, these views from respected faculty in prestigious universities are much more widespread in academia than we would be led to believe.

The degradation of races and low-income groups because of the misuse of test scores is only a small part of the real problem. The real problem is that we as educators have stood still for meaningless mental measurement. We have allowed it to become a major part of professional practice. We give it legitimacy in the professional courses that we teach, even though we have neither research nor practice that shows that mental measurement of human capacity as we now apply it helps us to serve students better. We have supported, or we have failed to criticize vigorously, the wholesale organization of the schools in response to crude and invalid testing. Injured clients have had to appeal to the courts and legislatures in order to gain relief as our professionals have stood and still stand silently.

IQ testing is an anachronism. Only pseudo-science supports its use. This is a part of the "it" that our reform efforts have failed to address. There

is only one test of the value of IQ testing and IQ thinking, and it is not a question of bias. The acid test is whether it helps us to design educational treatments that work.

My closer focus here is on special education because, more than anything else, special education offers us a great opportunity to see our ideas in action, and to see if they are in any way linked to benefits for children. Special education practices reflect most clearly the dynamics of equity and inequity in education and our part in the process.

We are prisoners of a way of thinking that prevents us from educating teachers so that they can help to release the learning powers of vast numbers of our students. This is a way of thinking that we have inherited and that we continue to produce. Basically we have allowed the floor for expected academic achievement of our students to be too low. If professionals rationalize this condition, they will cripple teachers who serve children, helping them to be comfortable with low expectations for their students and with mediocre results.

The pervasiveness of this way of thinking is manifest in the recent studies by Dr. Harold Stevenson at the University of Michigan and Dr. Kenneth Travers at the University of Illinois. These were comparative studies of academic achievement among several industrial nations. Stevenson and Travers say that while some countries such as Japan believe that academic achievement comes because of hard work, "Americans tend to see ability to do school work as innate." Our wholesale tracking system and all that goes with it is a direct outgrowth of such beliefs. If we are unable to entertain the idea that this way of operating must be changed, then equity will not be possible.

It should not be necessary to point out that these beliefs do not have a valid empirical foundation (Glass, 1983). We use the results of thousands of correlational studies as a basis for our opinions. We have few experimental studies that control for the quality of teaching offered to different groups of students. We have never ruled out the effects of the differences in exposure when we compare groups. As a result, our research is often mere pseudoscience that emphasizes the obvious, which may be stated as follows. "If the present educational treatment of children continues, children will maintain their academic ranks over time, and the relative performance level of all children will remain the same." We seem not to know what to do to make meaningful changes that will yield dramatically higher results for all children.

Education Week (Viader, 1987) reports that while all but one of the major reform reports said nothing about special education, AACTE and the

Council for Exceptional children were to convene task forces in February 1987 to draft position papers on how teacher education should be changed. However, if the *Education Week* report is correct in describing the agenda items for the task forces, there is real reason to be concerned about the possibilities for meaningful special education reform, since as with general education reform reports, the "it" in special education may very well be unexamined. For example, the questions to be addressed include:

- Should special educators receive a special national certification if national certification comes?
- Should special educators be required to have a graduate degree?
- Should mainstream educators teach more of the currently labeled special education students?
- Should special educators be given a generic or specific certification?

While these questions require answers, the fundamental questions which remain unasked and unanswered are:

- What are the benefits of special education?
- Under what conditions are special education methods beneficial, if at all?

This set of questions must be answered first. Then the previous questions can be answered. From an equity perspective, this is cause for serious concern. The National Academy of Sciences report, *Placing Children in Special Education: A Strategy for Equity* (Heller, Holtzman, and Messick, 1982) found little or no empirical support for the validity of professional constructs in special education, the validity of assessment practices, or most important of all, the validity of professional treatment in special education. Other major national reports say or imply the same thing. If this is true, urgent action is required. When we view the distribution of children in special education categories, we find them overwhelmingly in the soft categories of "learning disability" and "educable mental retarded." Moreover, we find that they remain in these categories throughout their school careers. Unless these fundamental conditions are changed in special education, we will not see meaningful reform in education at any level. We will merely see more efficiency in and legitimation for what we are already doing.

If we intend to respond to equity issues in teacher education, the litmus test of our sincerity and of the meaning of our efforts will be how we respond to the grossly overgrown and in some cases invalid areas of special education. Teacher educators are responsible for the knowledge base that supports these practices.

I know that real disabilities do exist in children. I also believe that valid pedagogy exists for many validly diagnosed conditions. However, attempts to do valid diagnosis and valid treatment are confounded because of the overwhelming numbers of misdiagnosed children who appear in the soft categories.

There is one thing that puzzles me greatly about teacher education. That is our failure to embrace certain highly successful practices, that is, pedagogical practices that have been articulated and can be taught to others. The widespread failure of children from certain ethnic populations in the face of clear demonstrations that such failure is totally avoidable is a national disgrace. For example, Project SEED has shown that these children learn, enjoy, and thrive on abstract, conceptually oriented mathematics, especially during the primary and elementary grades. Yet even though this pedagogy has been available for nearly twenty years, I have yet to see it or anything as powerful taught in our colleges of education as a part of our regular program. Reuven Feverstein's cognitive modifiable assessment and pedagogy, called "Dynamic Assessment and Instrumental Enrichment," is a thirty-year-old, successful pedagogy with children who are at risk. During that thirty-year period, it has not attracted the interest of many teacher educators.

In many cases, the answers to our pedagogical questions already exist. Somehow, we must find a way to guarantee that mainstream teacher educators are aware of all such practices and that they account for them in the teacher education program.

Tied to but different from the matter of IQ testing and special education is the reality of racism and other forms of domination in the society as a long-term problem. It spills over into every aspect of society, especially into education. As a result, it too, must be a topic for teacher training. What role does racism play in curriculum, in pedagogy, in psychology? There is a body of literature on this problem. But search the indexes of texts and the syllabi of professors in education, and we are unlikely to find serious and competent attention to this evil. Where are our theories on the origin and remedies for this the number-one mental health problem in our nation?

Our third equity step in teacher education is to purge the existing curriculum of materials and practices that actually support the beliefs and prac-

tices that produce inequity in the schools, and to place into our curriculum the competent study of racism and other "isms" and their remedies.

4. *Teacher Education Models.* Partly because of the ideology in education that has evolved, our trained teachers are not led to expect that they can be powerful agents of change in the lives of children. Only since the work of Ronald Edmonds and his associates in the school-effectiveness research community, have large numbers of practitioners dared to believe deeply in the power of the educator to help children to overcome environmental deficiencies. Our clinical experiences should have led us to the conclusion that some schools that serve the poor and dispossessed were highly successful, long before this fact was confirmed by researchers. For some of our number, neither clinical observation nor formal research confirmation are sufficient to provide them with a faith in the power of teaching to get results with all students.

If one thing is needed in teacher education, it is this. Teacher candidates must be exposed to settings where teachers are successful teaching those children on the "bottom of the pile" who normally fail. They will never believe that all children can learn well unless they try their hands at and are successful in settings where they fear failure. It is a pity that few teacher educators seem to know about the locations of schools that have a track record of success with low income minority and poor children. How can equity be produced by our graduates if live models of success are not available?

Included in the fourth equity step in teacher education, is the need to identify, observe, record, and use the experiences of educators who are successful with populations that are at risk. Truly competent "lead teachers" and true professors are those who can produce the highest quality results with all children and who can transmit the elements of their successful practice to others.

5. *Teacher Education Resources.* I make it a practice, whenever possible, to review the types of books and audio-visual media materials that teacher educators provide to trainees. When these holdings are reviewed from an equity perspective, it is clear that the work of the teacher educator often yields one sided if not harmful results. For example, there is a need for samples of ethnically representative curriculum materials in all academic areas, materials that are truthful and meaningful. The same is true of audio-visual media of live events. Yet few if any teacher education institutions can provide raw unedited film or video recordings of real success in classrooms, to demonstrate how minority and poor children can learn complex mental tasks when good teaching is provided. Few can display samples of appropriate multi-ethnic curriculum materials. Few possess a professional

library with references in history, psychology, or sociology that are critical to an understanding of the unique experience of minority and low socio-economic groups, and to an understanding of racism and other forms of oppression in the schools and in society.

The fifth equity step in teacher education is to review existing professional resources to insure that things necessary to an equity oriented program are available. This is a professional task that requires specialized expertise.

6. *Advocacy in Teacher Education.* As I review the landscape where the struggle for equity has taken place, I see the remnants of many battles. Almost always, these equity battles have been fought by lonely individuals and small groups, sometimes aided by professional civil rights organizations. What I have seldom seen is professional organizations taking early strong leadership positions on equity matters. For example, for nearly fifteen years a small group of African American psychologists, aided by a few of their European American colleagues for a small part of the time, have carried on a court battle to stop the use of invalid IQ tests with African American children. The NAACP and the federally supported Legal Defense lawyers did the legal work. The case has now been resolved in favor of the misclassified African American plaintiffs at the Federal District Court appellate level. Having been personally involved with that landmark case, I can recall with great disappointment the silence of the major professional organizations on this vital professional matter. Those who did speak out and who are still speaking out loudly seem to be trying desperately to return to the use of invalid IQ tests. Even now, many members of the California Association of School Psychologists, if opinions expressed in their periodical are typical, seem to regret the court decision. The weight of their opinion seems to be in favor of continuing a discredited practice.

One may understand the financial interests that many psychometrists have in continuing to give IQ tests. The thing that it is difficult to understand is the silence of educational organizations. Since special education pedagogy is tied to testing, what is the professional educator's position on the educational utility of this archaic practice? This struggle is still in process, both in the ninth Federal District and outside it, where this inequitable and invalid practice continues unabated.

This is but one example of an equity issue where the minority needs the majority to help to protect its rights and entitlements, and where the profession has a validity issue to face. This is but one example of the principle. There are many other issues where an appropriate professional stand ought to be taken. The use of paper-and-pencil tests to eliminate teachers in

training and practicing teachers from the profession is another example. There are others.

This sixth equity step in teacher education includes a review of our field in order to determine where it is appropriate to take activist advocacy positions in support of equity. Naturally, this assumes that our advocacy positions are professionally sound.

Conclusion

I have never doubted the ability of well-trained, highly motivated, and well-educated educators to serve all our children well. I have made thousands of observations of just such educators. I have seen them turn children's lives around. I have seen them turn depressed school environments into highly charged, exciting, and wonderful places to be. Most of all, I have seen them transform themselves into powerful professionals. I know that such transformations can be made in a remarkably short period of time. As Ronald Edmonds used to say, "We already know all that we need to know to educate all the children whose education is of importance to us. Whether we do or do not depends upon how we feel about the fact that we have not done it."

I believe that the same thing is true of teacher education for equity and excellence. There are many teachers who can produce high achievement with all children. There are many who know how to teach teachers how to be successful. It is the success models in teaching and teacher education that we must follow, not tradition for its own sake.

I cannot predict the future. I do know that we know what to do. I do not know if we will do what we know to do. I do know that our professional self-respect hangs in the balance. But more than that, the futures of all of our children and of the nation itself hang in the balance. Both equity and excellence are urgent needs. Several nations have already shown that success is possible. Some of those very nations are now locked in a life-and-death economic struggle with us, a struggle that they could very well win because of their investment in the development of intellectual resources of all their people.

Yet it is still possible for the United States to have any future that we choose to have. I believe that teacher educators will play no small part in that future, no matter what it is. Let us hope that we choose excellence and equity.

References

Adams, Hunter Javelin (1987). African and African American Contribution to Science and Technology, Portland, Oregon: Portland Public Schools.

Beane, D.B. (1985). Mathematics and Science: Critical Filters for the Future of Minority Students, Washington, DC: The Mid-Atlantic Center for Race Equity, The American University.

Brown, C.S. (1986). Ready from Within: Septima Clark and the Civil Rights Movement, Navato, California: Wild Trees Press.

Brown, A.L., and Campione, J. (1986). "Psychological Theory and the Study of Learning Disabilities," American Psychologist, 41(10), 1059–1068.

Chase, A. (1977). The Legacy of Malthus: The Social Cost of Scientific Racism, New York: Alfred A. Knopf.

Crouse, J. (1986). "Should a Million and a Half Students Be Required to Take the SAT Next Year?" Phi Delta Kappan, 67(5), 346–352.

Feuerstein, R., et al. (1971). The Dynamic Assessment of Retarded Performers, Baltimore: University Park Press.

Freire, Paulo (1973). Education for Critical Consciousness, New York: Seabury.

Glass, G.V. (1983). "Effectiveness of Special Education," Policy Studies Review, 2(1), 65–78.

Gould, S. (1981). "The Mismeasure of Man," Review, New York: W.W. Norton.

Hilliard, A.G., III (1983). "IQ and the Courts: Larry P. vs. Wilson Riles and P.A.S.E. vs. Hannon," Journal of Black Psychology, 10(1), 1–18.

Livingston, David (Ed.) (1987). Critical Pedagogy and Cultural Power, Massachusetts: Bergin and Garvey.

Messick, S. (1980). The Effectiveness of Coaching for the SAT, Princeton: Educational Testing Service.

Rosenholtz, S.J. (1985). "Political Myths about Education Reform: Lessons from Research on Teaching," Phi Delta Kappan, 6(5), 349–354.

Slack, W., and Porter, D. (1980). "The Scholastic Aptitude Test: A Critical Appraisal," Harvard Educational Review, 50(2), 154–175.

Viadero, Deborah (1987). "Long Overlooked, Special Education May Soon Get Reformer's Attention," Education Week, 6(17), 1 and 21.

Weinberg, M. (1977). A Chance to Learn: The History of Race and Education in the United States, London: Cambridge University Press.

Woodson, C. (1969). Miseducation of the Negro, Washington, DC: Associated Publishers.

"IQ gap linked to job lags, crime," (1985) The Monitor, 18(2), 18.

EDUCATION AND THE AMERICAN SOCIETY: CAN WE REALIZE THE DREAM?

Mary Hatwood Futrell

As I look ahead to the future of American education, I can say with absolute certainty that I am not sure what will happen.

The reason I can make such a definitive statement is because I sense that the education reform movement is so future-oriented that it tempts many and seduces some into forgetfulness – forgetfulness of our national heritage, forgetfulness of our democratic heritage.

As a result, the reform movement remains divided between those who respect the lessons of the past and those who reject the lessons of the past, between those who see the American Dream embodied in the teachings of Abraham Lincoln and those who see the American Dream embodied in the teachings of Charles Darwin, between those who say that excellence and equity are allies and those who say that excellence and equity are antagonists.

I believe it is now clear that unless we as a nation, unless we as a community of educators, affirm our twin commitment to equity and excellence,

the American Dream will turn into a nightmare that mocks the ideals of the Constitution. Equity and excellence – the two E's – must be as important to us as the three R's.

Today, of course, the two E's are under siege. President Reagan has spearheaded the retreat from equity. The speed of this retreat is evident in the Administration's proposals for higher education. At a time when the college enrollments of minority students, disadvantaged students, and students from marginally middle-class families continue to decline, this Administration proposes to make it virtually impossible for three million students to attend college. The Administration tells us that the funds that will disappear as a result of drastic and cruel reductions in Pell Grants, supplemental education opportunity grants, and work/study programs will be replaced by loan programs.

One of the most astute comments on this proposal has come from AASCU president Allan Oster. "The proposed education budget," says Oster, "would create a new debtor class, particularly if the new income contingent student loan program is passed. A better name for this program would be *The Student Lifetime Indenture Program* – SLIP."

This Administration seems to "SLIP" a lot. And the education community cannot and will not excuse or condone these slips, these slides toward injustice. We can make equity a reality. We can educate all students to their full potential. But only if we restructure schools to more effectively educate students. Only if we revitalize teacher education. Only if we change our attitude toward those we today pronounce uneducable.

On this issue, let me inject a personal note.

My mother, a widow with two young daughters, had to raise her children alone on the salary she earned working as a maid and short-order cook for fifteen dollars a week. But she never let adversity in any way dilute the emphasis she placed on education. And she told me in no uncertain terms that poverty, race, gender, and peer pressure were never to be used as an excuse for not achieving in school.

My teachers reinforced that message. They held high expectations – both academically and behaviorally. They were excellent teachers, powerful role models, true professionals. They opened whole new worlds for me – the worlds of Shakespeare and Chaucer and Socrates, the worlds of mathematics, science, history, and business. They taught me how to conduct research, then made sure I got plenty of practice. As I look back, I think the only time they

ever failed was when they tried to teach me to sing. They were, after all, human.

Neither my mother nor my teachers were ever easy on me. If I misbehaved in class or slacked off in any way, I was dealt with firmly. I resented their strictness, but I obeyed. I studied. I grew.

Later, those same teachers not only helped me get grants to attend college, but raised money through local churches to help finance my education. The same demanding standards greeted me at Virginia State College and George Washington University.

In retrospect, I'm convinced that what was critical throughout my schooling at every level was the presence of teachers who believed in me and taught me to believe in myself. And that experience points, I believe, to fundamental difficulties that minority students and disadvantaged students confront today. For far too many of these students, school is one more hard knock in a life of hard knocks. Low self-esteem is lowered further. Despair deepens.

It is now clear that no matter how comprehensive the institutional changes we make, those changes will count for little, may count for nothing—unless institutional change is accompanied by attitudinal change. Educating all students begins with the belief—the rock solid conviction—that all students are educable. This conviction must extend from kindergarten to graduate school. And this conviction must extend to the mounting numbers of students who are strangers in a strange land, students alienated from the culture and often from the language of the United States.

This conviction must also extend to the minority students whose only bootstraps in life may be the quality of education they receive. We dare not neglect or underestimate this population. The latest demographic projections tell us that between now and the year 2020, a short 33 years from today, our nation's black population will expand from 11 to 14 percent. The Hispanic population will expand from 6 to 15 percent. The Native American population will double to 1 percent. And the Asian population will expand from 1.5 to 5 percent.

This expanding population is disproportionately disadvantaged. But these minority students are not alone. Today, more than one-fifth of all American youngsters are poor. An increase of 33 percent since 1979. Close to 40 percent of all Hispanic youth live in poverty, as do more than half of all black children. But by far the greatest number of children who live in poverty are not black or brown or yellow. They are white. We deceive ourselves if we

view poverty, and the effects of poverty, as a problem confined to the ghettos and barrios that scar the American landscape.

Today, at least one-tenth of all children live with parents who are poorly educated. Millions live with parents who are illiterate or lack English proficiency. And hundreds of thousands are the offspring of teenage parents who can offer their children little or no guidance or discipline.

Today, far too many children attend school unable to concentrate on their studies because they are hungry, malnourished, ill-clothed, or suffering from high levels of stress. At-risk students are now estimated to constitute 30 percent of all school-aged children. To these statistics must be added 1,070,000 students who drop out of school each year.

To neglect this population would be an act of cultural suicide and economic self-destruction. So let us not be swayed by the callous indifference of the current Administration in Washington. Neglect is the inevitable and tragic offshoot of this Administration's policies. That neglect dims the American Dream. And in time that neglect could extinguish the American Dream.

Of course, Secretary Bennett, despite advocating a $5.5 billion cut in federal aid to education, continues to proclaim that education has improved during the Reagan Administration's watch. In many ways, that is true.

The Reagan Administration has watched the dropout rate skyrocket while it has pulled the rug from beneath programs that could have sent those rates plummeting. The Reagan Administration has watched while Congress rejected the dismantling of essential education programs. The Reagan Administration has watched as members of Congress from both parties have provided the resources needed to sustain educational opportunities. The Reagan Administration has watched as state after state has risen to the challenge of education reform. The Reagan Administration has watched as so many have struggled so relentlessly to upgrade the standards in your colleges of education.

The Reagan/Bennett team watches—and watches. Then, when the play is done, it rushes onto the field and spikes the ball.

I wonder what our children think of this spectacle. I wonder what our children think when the Secretary of Education, whose overriding responsibility is to serve as an advocate for this nation's students, goes before Congress to plead for cuts in the education budget. I wonder what our children think when, by contrast, Secretary Weinberger advocates a third of a trillion

dollar increase in defense spending. Maybe we should try to shift and have Weinberger serve as education secretary.

I have waited more than two years for Secretary of Education William Bennett to show, just once, fidelity to the ideals on which he endlessly lectures the American people. I have waited to see the Secretary's admiration for Socrates reflected in respect for reasoned dialogue. I have waited for the Secretary to use his knowledge of the Constitution and the Declaration of Independence as more than fodder for erudite lectures. And I have waited for the Secretary to fulfill the responsibilities of his office by acting positively on behalf of this nation's children.

This Administration's motto has become – educate the best, forget the rest. *And that is why this Administration now seeks to slash the federal funds for education by 30 percent.* In light of the Administration's rhetoric about excellence in education, the proposed budget is nothing short of duplicitous.

Florida Senator Lawton Chiles said it best, "Slashing the education budget by 30 percent is like selling your insurance policy in order to buy skydiving lessons." I would add to Senator Chiles' comment the observation that, with regard to disadvantaged students, Reagan and Bennett would not include parachutes with the skydiving lessons.

The fact that those who do not respect the ideal of equity now dominate the executive branch of the government makes our responsibility clear. We must become the champions of equity. We must devise strategies that will make equity a reality despite President Reagan, despite Secretary Bennett, despite the anorexic budget this Administration has proposed.

How to begin?

Recall the demographic data I presented earlier. By the year 2020, 35 percent of our nation's population will consist of minorities. And yet today, minority teachers comprise a mere 8 percent of the K–12 teaching force. And that figure is projected to drop to 5 percent by the end of this decade.

Five percent minority teachers, 35 percent minority students. We have both a professional and a moral responsibility to reverse this trend. For this is not simply a tragedy for minorities. This is a tragedy for America. We owe all students a vision of the racial, ethnic, and religious mosaic that is America. We owe all students first-hand evidence that America's diversity is America's strength. We owe all students lessons in cross-cultural understanding.

But the simple fact is that we will not be able to offer students these lessons unless the composition of our nations' teaching force changes dramatically and changes soon. For this reason, we must launch an unrelenting campaign to recruit more high-ability students, and in particular, more minority students into the K–12 teaching force.

I know very well that in recent years a disproportionate number of minority candidates have failed the tests required for certification. That is cause for concern and it is cause for action. Action which must create another kind of partnership. A partnership created between white institutions and traditionally black colleges.

I have listened long and I believe I have listened well to discussions of minorities in our professions. I have also listened to both accolades and expressions of concern for the black institutions that graduate 45 percent of all black educators.

Yes, there is a lot of talk. Unfortunately, there is also a lot of posturing. And I believe posturing must give way to real commitment: the restructuring of the teaching profession must include an unrelenting commitment to sustain and reinvigorate traditionally black institutions. It would, I believe, be tragic if black schools of education met the same fate as black schools of medicine. Prior to the decades when the medical profession moved toward genuine professionalism, seven black medical schools and numerous schools that trained women doctors flourished. But when the transformation of medicine began, all but two of this nation's black schools—Howard and Meharry—were closed . . . and remain closed.

The result? An immediate and precipitous decline in the number of both minority and female doctors, a decline that appears to be ending for women, but which continues for minorities. This same phenomenon can be seen in the legal, architectural, and accounting professions. For minorities, these professions are virtually closed shops. And I believe that as we move forward with the work of reform, we would do well to recall Santayana's oft-quoted warning that, "those who cannot remember the past are condemned to repeat it."

Economically, we cannot afford that repetition. And morally, we cannot justify that repetition.

I am in no way saying that minorities and women should not be held to the highest, most rigorous professional standards. Of course we should, as should all who aspire to join our profession. But at the same time, we must not allow our profession to fall into the same quagmire that other professions

have failed to avoid. Our quest for excellence will fail if we accept lip-service to the ideals of equity and inclusiveness and justice. We need to initiate a genuine, active, and comprehensive effort to ensure that minority institutions retain the capability to continue their vital mission; and that all teacher preparation institutions solidify their commitment to prepare minority and nonminority students to teach our children.

All educators must spearhead this effort. We must keep the issue of equity at the forefront of the reform debate. We must make the issue of equity a top priority for ourselves, for our colleagues, for teachers' unions, above all for the public. We must keep the issue of equity both visible and vibrant. To do otherwise would be to deny a fundamental moral responsibility to our profession and to this nation's children.

Our actions must ensure that minority students receive the counseling and tutorial services that will prepare them for demanding teacher preparation programs. The pipeline to success as a college student and later as a classroom teacher must be clearly articulated. Students must receive the encouragement, the support, and the academic preparation they need to enter and complete college.

The key to the success of that pipeline, I believe, is a closer alliance between teacher educators and local school districts. And that pipeline should extend to the preschool population.

I encourage teacher educators to help local schools develop the instructional strategies and the rigorous academic programs that will improve student performance. Just as importantly, teacher educators must help in bringing all school personnel to believe in the potential of our increasingly pluralistic student population. These students can learn if we believe they can learn – and if we imbue them with that same belief.

That is a beginning, a beginning that will say to the Administration in Washington, "We do not accept your ideology. We know that an ideology that is anti-children, anti-minority, anti-disadvantaged is also anti-growth, anti-development, anti-national security."

I believe deeply that education is a moral mission. And I believe the moral imperative of the hour is clear: we must unleash the potential within all students. We must educate all students in accord with the highest possible standards.

That moral imperative and, let me add, it is also an economic imperative, demands a vast new repertoire of strategies. I commend the energetic

commitment that AACTE, AASCU and the Holmes Group have demonstrated to radically redesign and upgrade teacher preparation programs. But in the long run, if these strategies are to be successful, they must be the joint products of K–12 teachers, administrators, teacher educators, deans, and presidents of our schools of education. We need now as never before to forge a culture of cooperation within the entire education community.

Only this cooperative effort can ensure that future practitioners will be prepared to effectively reach out and effectively teach our culturally and ethnically diverse student population. Only a cooperative effort can ensure the success of both national and state professional standards boards.

Last summer the 8,000 delegates attending NEA's Representative Assembly voted to support the creation of a National Board of Professional Teaching Standards. In addition, we reaffirmed our commitment to the creation of state standards boards that would work in conjunction with the national board.

Why does NEA, while supporting a national professional standards board, still insist on the necessity of state-level professional standards boards? To answer that question, let me quote from sociologist Paul Starr's Pulitzer Prize winning study, *The Societal Transformation of American Medicine.*

"A profession," Starr maintains, "differs from other occupations by its ability to set its own rules and regulations." Starr further argues that medicine became a profession worthy of respect only when it established clear boundaries between qualified practitioners and untrained practitioners. And Starr notes that the impetus for the transformation of medicine arose from the states, not from a national agency. Sound medical practice drove out quackery when states seized the initiative, and the medical community became self-governing and self-monitoring.

I believe that history lesson is worth reflection. So too is the lesson reflected in the fact that the professional standards boards in medicine, law, architecture, and accounting are all governed by the members of those professions. The problems that today confront education will persist until these lessons are learned and learned well.

The research on this point is elaborate and it is incontrovertible. If we want a self-improving profession, we must create a self-governing profession. If we want professional results, we must grant teachers professional recognition.

Today, that goal is within reach. But the question still before us is how to ensure that our future colleagues will be equal to the challenges that await them. The answer is not complicated: only if readiness for this challenge is a prerequisite for service in the classroom, only if the entry-way to service in the classroom is a barrier to the unprepared and the incompetent, only if we create a barrier that the unprepared and the incompetent will find impenetrable, only if a state professional standards board mandates that practitioners possess the abilities necessary to reach every student – the abilities to unlock the full potential of every child who enters our classrooms.

We can protect the integrity of our profession by protecting the entryway to our profession. That protection should be the first responsibility of state boards of education. Those boards must reject all arguments for the continuation of emergency, provisional, and probationary certification. And those state boards must show their willingness to take their responsibilities seriously.

Now more than ever, we educators need togetherness. As Booker T. Washington said, "We can stand as divided as the fingers on our hand or as tightly bound as a fist." Only our combined efforts can truly transform America from a nation at risk into a nation prepared.

More than two decades ago, Martin Luther King, Jr., writing from his cell in the Birmingham jail, explained why we can't wait for justice. Today, sadly, we must once again deliver that explanation. We can't wait, quite simply, because the future of this democracy is at stake. The future of the American Dream is at stake.

You and I can salvage that dream. We can sustain that dream. We can reinvigorate that dream.

Robert Frost once wrote that, "The world is full of willing people; some willing to work, the rest willing to let them."

We can't condone professional indolence from any segment of the education community. If teachers and teacher educators expect to transform teaching from a job into a profession, from an obstacle course that frustrates the best and the brightest into an avenue that brings out the best of the best and the brightest, we must work hard and we must work together.

I believe we can get the job done. I believe we can move steadily toward the day when our schools of education are held in higher esteem than schools of architecture and law and medicine. I believe we can ensure teachers the professional status we have sought for so long. I believe that

together we can prove that equity and excellence are compatible goals and are goals that imply one another.

We can disprove the cynics who seem to believe that elitist distinctions are an inevitable part of the life of this republic. We can prove that the power of democratic principles is stronger than the wind of demographic change and we can prove that the American Dream need never be sacrificed on the altar of fiscal exigency.

These are noble goals. They are goals that respect the best of America's heritage. And they bring to mind the words of Martin Luther King, Jr., who reminded us of what we must remember today and what will sustain us through our tomorrows. "The ultimate test of a people," Dr. King stated, "is not where they stand in moments of comfort and convenience, but where they stand at times of challenge and controversy."

The time of challenge and controversy is upon us. Let us stand with integrity. Let us tolerate no retreat from equity. Let us stand ready for the demanding responsibilities that await us. As we confront the challenge of giving new life to the age-old American Dream, let us say, in the words of the President who was Dr. King's contemporary and moral ally, "We do not shrink from this responsibility. We welcome it."

BUILDING A COMMUNITY OF COMMON INTEREST

William E. Gardner

These comments deal with problems in teacher education, and I want to begin by quoting Kevin Ryan about problems in our field. He called them

> " . . . nagging realities which simply will not go away. How to prepare large numbers of young people to be effective teachers of our children and, then, how to keep those teachers performing at a high level are perennials in education. Because the tasks of intervening in someone's life and working with that person to improve teaching are so complex and elusive, they wear down both the practitioner and the researcher of teacher education. While teacher training has its fads and frills, it is basically an *unglamorous subject.* It is, nevertheless, *a burning presence* that lurks at the edge of all proposals to improve schools and cannot be ignored. Whatever the issue, the *ungra-*

cious question is eventually asked, 'Where do we get the teachers who can do these things?' "[1]

This brief paragraph contains some great metaphor material and several "eternal truths" regarding teacher education. Teacher education is a "nagging reality," the subject of great controversy past, present, and future. It is an "unglamorous subject," a confused and unattractive world which is enormously complex and exceptionally difficult to comprehend. But teacher education does in fact have a "burning presence" and has assumed a central position on the reform agenda of the day, a fact which makes the work of teacher educators just about the most important higher education work that can be done.

Here I will examine only a few of the aspects of this "burning presence" called teacher education and point to ways in which we can work productively through AACTE to move the field forward.

First, some comments on the context in which teacher education exists today. I will rely to a large extent on the excellent analysis that AACTE Executive Director David Imig provides periodically through what he calls an "environmental scan." My paraphrase of his analysis of the current scene in education can be summarized as follows: Education today is once again in the nation's spotlight because we are in the midst of the most recent in a long series of reform movements. This most recent reform movement was ushered in by the publication of *A Nation at Risk* about four years ago. This report called for a return to a previous era where standards were more demanding and test scores were higher. It called for secondary students either to study harder subjects or to study subjects harder. *Risk* itself may not have engaged in the time-honored American custom of "teacher bashing," but certainly the report did imply strongly that too many teachers were mediocre, textbooks and other materials were inadequate, and overall leadership was weak. It implied, too, that too much time was spent in teacher education courses and it offered the hope that more preparation in the liberal arts would produce a new generation of improved teachers.

What followed the publication of *Risk* was the most intense national debate about schools and teachers that we have seen for some years. From this debate grew reform movements in virtually every state. In the ensuing four years, more than 700 new education laws have been enacted and $3.5 billion in new money allocated for school use.

1. Ryan, Kevin (Ed.). (1975). Teacher education: The seventy-fourth yearbook of the National Society for the study of Education Part II (p. ix). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

It is extremely important to note that there has now been a shift in the center of gravity of this movement and the development of a new source of energy. The new center of gravity for the debate is the concern for the quality of the teacher cadre and the professionalization of teaching. The new source of energy comes from the major teachers' organizations themselves, the leadership of which has strongly stressed the improvement of teacher education as a basic strategy move. These new elements in the reform movement are best illustrated by referencing the reports of the Carnegie Forum, the Holmes Group, and the National Governors' Association and the reactions of the teachers' groups to them.

The current context is not at all a comfortable one for teacher education, because the debate, as we are all so well aware, centers on the extent and the quality of what we do for a living. It is somewhat of an over-simplification (but not a misleading one) to note that the debate involves two conflicting points of view. One of these takes the position that the problem with teacher education is that there is not enough of it. This viewpoint has attracted a host of commentators and researchers who advocate more heavily rationalized programs in teacher education, who advocate extended programs, and who identify heavily with the move to professionalize the field. They propose to accomplish this, in part at least, by carrying on teacher training in the same place as other professions do—in higher education institutions especially equipped and dedicated to that function. The other point of view holds that the problem in teacher education is that there is already too much of it. In effect, this is an abolition movement which would separate teacher education and higher education and leave prospective teachers to learn necessary knowledge skills under the tutelage of good classroom teachers. Many of us see this movement in the same way Thomas Jefferson viewed the Missouri Compromise in 1820—it was, he said, a "firebell in the night"—a dangerous set of circumstances which, if allowed to continue, would have dire consequences.

The troublesome and difficult context in which teacher education exists today has already had considerable effect on our lives. Here we can identify both good and bad things. Among the good things is the strong interest in teacher education shown by major foundations, by state governments, and by the leadership of the teacher organizations. National Education Association (NEA) President Mary Futrell's recent strong endorsement of the National Council of Accreditation for Teacher Education (NCATE) is a good illustration of this, as is the American Federation of Teachers' (AFT) bid to join NCATE and the supportive legislation enacted in many of our states. Among the bad things spawned by the current scene is the fact that significant voices are questioning the place of teacher education and encouraging "backdoor" programs which ignore higher education. Also among the bad things is the

apparent widening gulf that divides the leadership of teacher education, the impression felt and articulated by some that irreconcilable differences are developing between and among what are seen as factions in the teacher education community. While some of our critics characterize the teacher education establishment as a huge monolith, closely allied with officialdoms in state government and in public schools, we know that sharp differences of opinion have always been present. As a group of teacher education leaders, we do not constitute a powerful entrenched bureaucracy. In point of fact there are few bureaucratic aspects to teacher education nationwide which, ironically, may be one of our major problems. Responsibility and accountability for teacher education is so widely dispersed as to inhibit program change and improvement.[2]

I see potential danger for teacher education and for the teaching profession in this current scene. There are threats from outside, to be sure, but the greater danger is within our "loosely coupled" group. This danger is contained in the differences of opinion which might lead us to pursue only a narrow self-interest of purported benefit to part of the group but to the detriment of the whole enterprise.

A key question for the years just ahead is whether the various subgroups in teacher education can find common ground, whether we can find agreement on basic principles which we value and to which we can give our allegiance regardless of the things that divide us, the size of our institutions or the source of our financial support, and regardless of how complex or how simple our program structure is.

What are the principles or issues on which we should cooperate? I will concentrate here on only two of the agenda items where we as teacher educators have been the most vulnerable and where we have the most to gain by reaching consensus.

The first of these involves the shared need we have to improve the quality of our programs. It is the case that our programs are much better than their reputation. But we have not really applied all we know about the knowledge base to our programs. We have not really come to grips with the knowledge base for teaching, with those aspects of knowledge which separate teachers from lay people. We have not collectively and powerfully asserted that there is such a knowledge base for teaching, that this knowledge base is the subject matter of teacher education, and that it can and should be taught to prospective teachers.

2. Lanier, Judith E. (1986). Research on teacher education. In M.C. Wittrock, Handbook of research on teaching (3rd ed) (p. 557). New York: MacMillan.

Research which focuses attention on teaching and how to do it has been an important and productive research area in recent years. Results of these efforts have not as yet been fully developed or codified, but they are nonetheless a rich vein of information which even now provides an absolutely essential foundation for teaching. Moreover, it is this foundation which provides the best insurance policy we have against the disaster of backdoor routes to licensure. In short, we must use our progress to demonstrate that teaching is (in Lee Shulman's terms) a nonpedestrian activity.

It is painfully obvious that we do not know this new knowledge base as well as we should. Collectively we are well prepared in the more traditional areas of psychology of learning and sociology of education; but the newer knowledge base stresses the psychology of teaching and the sociology of the learner. We have a fair piece of work to do in providing faculty development activities on a broad base. We also need the development of experimental programs designed to find ways to teach these new aspects of the knowledge base. We need accentuated research efforts to continue its development and codification. And we need attention to assessment activities which allow people to demonstrate their knowledge and skill.

The second basic problem on which we need cooperative action is the student quality issue. In the popular mind education students are not academically talented and there are few, if any, drawn from the upper levels on measures of academic achievement. The result is to create in the popular mind and media the image of teacher as "dunce."

It does us little good to attach such images with the data we have on hand. While research does not support the picture of teacher as "dunce," neither does it describe a situation with which we can be satisfied.

The best findings from research can be summarized as follows: Teacher education enrolls a substantial number of students who are academically able. Many of these students graduate, get teaching positions, and persist in them. However, the problem we have is the problem of "too many lows," that is, too large a proportion of our student population nationwide is drawn from those who do not have average or above average academic ability. Too many students with low academic abilities are allowed to enter, and more importantly, too many are allowed to complete teacher education programs.

Clearly, we must move vigorously to resolve this issue. Individually and collectively we need to develop and support policies which will succeed in raising the overall norm for the teaching force from average and below, to average and above. There is no threat of a teacher shortage that is so serious as to cause us to change such a course.

There are other problems and issues that I could have identified as well. We have the chronic problem of underfunding in teacher education which leads to heavy teaching and incredibly high ratios of students to faculty in clinical settings. We have problems created by the changing demography of the nation which suggest the ugly specter of unequal educational opportunity coupled with a lower level of political support for the educational welfare of children and adolescents. These problems, too, belong on our agenda.

AACTE will this year provide the opportunity for institutions to cooperate in seeking resolution to this set of problems. Let me list some of the activities in which we will be engaged during 1987–88.

1. *Knowledge Base.* The Knowledge Base Action Group, formed this year as a part of the Center for Change in Teacher Education, has undertaken several activities as part of an effort to codify the knowledge base and to provide opportunities for faculties of our members to enhance their understanding and application of the knowledge base. Specifically this action group has initiated a project at my university under Professor Maynard Reynold's direction which is intended to help clarify and make public the knowledge base, to make teachers and teacher educators more accountable for "state of the art" standards and to help organize efforts for the improvement of teacher education. In the center of this activity is the preparation of a publication entitled the *Knowledge Base for Beginning Teachers,* a set of juried statements by leading figures in the various fields of teacher education. Work is now in progress on this publication with a tentative printing date in 18 months. This action group will also sponsor a set of workshops on the knowledge base for teachers following the very successful example of the first such workshop held in Atlanta in November of 1986.

2. *Accreditation.* We all know that AACTE was one of the parents of NCATE, and has continued its unbroken support for national accreditation. Several years ago this Association was the prime mover in the redesign of NCATE, and we have just appointed a committee under the leadership of Dale Scannell, University of Maryland, charged to review the implementation of that Redesign Project and to make recommendations on still other changes in NCATE structure and process. Part of their activity will entail an examination of standards which govern entry of students to teacher education programs with the eye toward increasing those standards in sensible and defensible ways. My experience with NCATE leads me to conclude that we can get just about any kind of standard we want as long as the standards we propose are high and consistent with scholarly work on teaching. No other organization or member of the NCATE family is likely to resist a strong, concerted effort on our part to create a new norm for prospective

teachers. And we should come together to find the norm on which we can agree.

3. *More Accreditation.* The Board of Directors has recently proposed a significant by-law change, that NCATE accreditation be a requirement for membership in AACTE. This proposal has been a bone of contention; it's already sparked a great deal of debate, the level of which I hope will increase considerably throughout the year. Some of our members see it as a move which would exacerbate the divisions which currently exist in the Association. Others reject that point of view and claim instead that this move will both strengthen this Association and the ties that bind us together. How? Because it would link us together in support of high quality accreditation and provide a clear symbol that we want quality in all teacher education programs. During the year the Association will provide the forum for active discussion of this proposal. It may be that we will ultimately reject such a requirement, but we will be far better able to accept or refute it after full and complete discussion. In any case we simply must come to grips collectively with the standards issue and we must do so soon.

4. *Center for Change.* We will continue the important activities begun this year under the Center for Change in Teacher Education. You have received a report of the Center which contains recommendations to AACTE to mount programs and activities in four important areas. As AACTE undertakes a continuous long-range planning process, these ideas will be incorporated in our future activities. At the next Board of Directors meeting we will consider the specific recommendations to determine which should be part of our long range agenda.

5. *Common Interest.* Finally, the Association, with support from the Johnson Foundation, will sponsor two conferences in the next six months directly related to these agenda items. The first of these will deal specifically with problems of how we continue to build a community of common interest. I have just recently sent letters of invitation to the leaders of AILACTE, TECSCU, Land Grant, Holmes Group, Division K of AERA, as well as the leadership of AACTE to Wingspread next June. This first conference will be convened for the express purpose of developing plans which will enable us to build a greater sense of community through identification of those interests which are shared by us all. The second of these conferences will center on equity issues and will be held at Wingspread next fall. The specific agenda items are yet to be determined but clearly our membership must be united in an active program to ensure equity in the teaching force as a basic principle. AACTE will do other things next fall as well. The important liaison work with the states and the federal government will continue as will our international activities and our publication activities. We will begin some

exciting ventures which will start in our new education division emphasizing workshops and seminars for members.

This total agenda is a most ambitious one. It is one which is calculated to promote the theme "Community of Common Interest." It will charge the organization's leadership to confront the issues of program and student quality and to do so both publicly and vigorously. It is an agenda which seeks to involve relatively large numbers of AACTE's members in a variety of ways. To some extent it follows the advice that Benjamin Franklin gave to early colonial leaders that they must hang together or they will all hang separately. In like fashion we must remind ourselves that our differences are small and unimportant compared to the ways we are alike. More importantly, the threats that come from others within teacher education are small compared with those from outside. This agenda is built on our common need for a community of common interest. Building such a community and strengthening our common interests must involve us all in putting aside our parochial concerns and putting together a common agenda linked to excellence. I invite your allegiance to this agenda and your participation in it.

FUTURE IMPLICATIONS: EDUCATION, EXCELLENCE, EQUITY

Norene F. Daly

Today, AACTE is more vital than ever before – more essential than ever before to our viability as a profession.

During 1986, much has been accomplished. The Board has aggressively undertaken issues which have the potential to further strengthen the profession and the Association. The membership has supported those actions. Much has changed within the Association, within our institutions, and within the educational environment.

Those changes have been documented by the membership in many ways in their response to my request for information about your programs. I thank you for cooperating with me in that endeavor. That information has been documented and described in the Association's Center for Change in Teacher Education. That effort will, I hope, continue to influence change in the profession for years to come.

Change has also been the hallmark of our efforts to confirm and strengthen NCATE. It is essential that that effort continue. A stronger accrediting body will only serve to enhance the profession. I urge everyone to see this as a priority which is more important than our individual institutional concerns; a priority and an endeavor which has long-term implications for further strengthening our profession, our students, and the schools wherein they will spend their professional careers.

There is much to celebrate; however, the viability of any professional association is dependent upon its ability to continue to adapt to meet new needs and its ability to address the future; therefore, as we celebrate the past, it is also essential that we contemplate the future, not only of our profession, but also of society.

It is that future which I want to discuss with you here: a future inextricably tied to change and rooted in the professional imperative to provide educational excellence for all – teachers and students.

Others who have addressed the theme of this Annual Meeting have eloquently urged us to attend to the critical emotional, social, and educational needs of the millions of children whose futures are at risk in this nation. Each year millions of those "at risk" children are born and millions of them enter our schools. That is a fact. We must pursue every means to change it. What we can begin now to change is the educational environment for those children so as to ensure that, although they may have been born "at risk," they need not be so all of their lives.

What is at stake? It is not just their future, but ours as well, and the future of our children and grandchildren – the future of this nation.

My remarks are rooted in the belief that this nation, once a nation of immigrants, had a vision of the future for all of its citizens; a vision which catapulted us into the position of global prominence which we have enjoyed. That position is in danger of being eroded and that future is in danger of being eroded; indeed, it has been eroded by a number of factors. The time has come for us to reconsider and restructure our priorities. The time has come for us to rekindle the vision that once was ours.

What is our vision of the future for this nation: its schools, its teachers, and its children? What are we, the community of teacher education, willing to do to build that vision, and determine a future which we know must be different from our present experience?

We are a community within a community: educators at colleges and universities which prepare more than 90% of this nation's teachers, administrators, and school support personnel. In this age of empowerment, that is an empowering thought. We are an extraordinary force in society and, if we can coalesce around a common vision of what should be in schools and in teacher education, we can change and redirect society.

Many of the teachers whom we are preparing in our programs today will have the potential to serve our nation's schools for the next forty years. Those who do, will teach the children of the 80's, the 90's, and the children of the first three decades of the new century. They will teach tomorrow's leaders, who, in turn, will determine the future of society.

It seems imperative that we prepare teachers who are themselves leaders; teachers who are empowered to enkindle in their students a vision of a society where there is educational excellence for all; teachers who have the courage and the will to recognize their role in shaping, not only the lives of their students, but also a society wherein all can realize their fullest potential.

There is no way we can accurately predict the circumstances which will confront today's twenty-one year old beginning teacher in the year 2027 when she will be only 61 years old. There is no way in which we can accurately describe the children whom she will teach. What we can ensure and can describe is her ability to change and grow as a professional, but only if we ourselves adopt a futuristic view of our task and dedicate ourselves anew to developing in our students a commitment to seeing themselves as learners all their lives long—able to adapt to the changing professional demands within their environment.

I referred earlier to the immigrant experience; it was the experience of my parents. My parents did not enjoy the benefits of a high school education; but they, like many other immigrants, believed that education was the answer for their children, and they were right. We must rekindle the vision which once was theirs. The vision which will empower the new immigrants, the powerless, and the "at risk" children in our schools to lead lives which will not leave them trapped in a permanent economic and social underclass—a cycle of hopelessness.

We have an opportunity to exercise leadership in preparing teachers for the real world; a world where there will be more poor minority children, more children in danger of never realizing the vision. We must not be accomplices in perpetuating the myth that the failure of poor, minority students is inevitable. Rather, we must prepare the most competent teachers and

demand working environments wherein they, and all of their students, are expected to succeed and do succeed.

In short, we have the power and the opportunity to decide what kind of teaching force this nation is going to have, indeed, must have. If we do not make that decision, we are deciding the kind of teaching force we will have, by default.

As we attempt to achieve that agenda – determining the character of the profession of the future – we must never lose sight of the fact that the primary client for our services is not the teacher, but the child. We can serve that client best by serving our profession; by committing ourselves anew to the preparation of teachers, administrators, and school support personnel who are competent above all; who are creative, resourceful, compassionate, and themselves committed to providing educational excellence for all of their students.

As we engage in our more esoteric endeavors (yes, those too are essential to the revitalization of our profession), we must realize that those endeavors serve the larger purpose which is to build an educational environment and a community, wherein the needs of society are served; but, we must be ever aware that the needs and aspirations of the individual have primacy.

We can achieve consensus on the task which confronts us: rekindling the vision of the future which holds promise of educational excellence and equity for all; and that we must. At the same time, we must also be cognizant of those forces which would deter us from our goal. They are real. They are prodigious. Some of them represent forces within the profession, some, opposition from outside of our ranks.

As we look within, it is important that we realize that there is no one group within teacher education which can or should dictate the future of the profession. The time has come for us to recognize the division within our ranks and unite around our common purpose. Only as a united Association and as a united profession can we hope to achieve. No one segment of the teacher education community can stand alone and be recognized as having the power to adequately address the future's agenda and the critical dilemmas confronting us; not AILACTE, not the Holmes Group, not the Land Grant deans, and not TECSCU. Addressing the issue of building a community of excellence and concern as an Association is our only hope for survival as a profession. If we do not execute that agenda and seize the moment, others will see our disarray and fill the void.

As we look outward from our ranks, we must be militant in our aggressive pursuit of resources to support achievement of our agenda. If you wonder why you have not seen William Bennett at this meeting, it is not because he was not invited; it is because he has chosen not to come. He has chosen to be an apologist for an administration which would continue to pursue its erosion of resources which should be devoted to addressing the critical problems confronting our schools. He chose not to explain why he continues to use his "bully pulpit" to create in a concerned public a false sense of security about the future of American education. He chose not to explain why he supports reducing funds for handicapped students by $336 million. He chose not to explain why he has advocated cutting $11 million from the Christa McAuliffe Teacher Training and Improvement Act, a program designed to stimulate and reward excellence in teaching. He chose not to explain why he has proposed slashing funding for TRIO programs for disadvantaged youths by $94 million. He chose not to explain why he supports the elimination of all funding for vocational education.

Secretary Bennett has chosen to be a spokesperson for an administration which would attempt to balance the budget by cutting $5.5 billion out of the heart of an already inadequate resource base. He has chosen to defend this administration's seven-year record of budgetary cuts in education. He has chosen not to be confronted by us; to be silent. We can only interpret that silence as consent to an agenda which would effectively lay waste to much of the progress we have worked so hard to achieve.

We cannot be silent. We must remind those who are responsible for present educational policy that what they do today will determine the future of the educational enterprise which is our life work. We must remind them that the power of this nation lies not in its might, but within its minds. The future of this nation rests with those teachers whose professional lives we are shaping and with those students whose lives and futures they, in turn, will shape.

As educators, we know that schooling does not guarantee access to the future; however, we also know that denying the opportunity for educational equity will guarantee that those in our society who are most vulnerable will not have access. Let us be instruments in focusing the energy around educational reform so that it can be a decisive factor in changing society. Let us put the future within the grasp of all of our nation's children.

We cannot achieve this by acting alone; far more effective will be our actions in concert. This Association we celebrate; this professional nexus which we claim, has a fragility of which we must be cognizant and a vigor which we must nurture.

One of my last acts as president of this Association will be to ask you to unite as professionals in support of our common goals; in support of this Association:

- to be advocates for the disadvantaged and the handicapped; the voices they do not have; the hope they must have;
- to goad this administration to act on behalf of the educational well-being of all of our nation's children;
- to aggressively address the division within our ranks, realizing that the goal we pursue is far more important than the independent agenda we might address;
- to actively support the Association's efforts to further strengthen NCATE and build a collaborative model for accreditation of teacher education which will recognize the needs and aspirations of all of the stakeholders;
- to take the best from each model of teacher preparation and prepare the best qualified teachers: competent, compassionate, courageous, empowered people;
- to be careful not to be caught in the crossfire which will rage around the issue of empowerment, realizing that ultimately those who must be empowered are this nation's children;
- to participate in the Association's agenda by being critical activists instead of active critics; and,
- to be creative, energetic, wise, and willing to intensify our support of AACTE and thereby lend our power to its power so that we can all be stronger as a result.

The Association is what we make it. The opportunity is ours; the challenge is to seize it. I urge you to take bold measures so that we can actualize the reform agenda on our own terms.

The tidal wave of reform burst upon us with the issuance of *A Nation at Risk* with its martial metaphors and portentous rhetoric. That rhetoric was morbidly predictive; the metaphors had resonant implications as we witnessed the wave of reform move from schools, to teachers, to teacher education. We cannot be apologists for the status quo. We must inject a new salient into the move to achieve excellence.

The martial metaphor is dependent upon power. Let that power be our ability and will to make teaching and learning truly empowering, forces which will enable individuals to change their own lives and the lives of others. In his admonition to his dying father, the poet, Dylan Thomas, said: "Do not go gentle into that good night, rage, rage against the dying of the light." We must rage against the dying of the light, which is the death of hope for many of our nation's children. The opportunity is ours to change the way in which schools, children, teachers, and all of us deal with the future. Let us seize that opportunity and rekindle the vision that once was ours.

Selected Papers From the 1987 Annual Meeting of the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education

The Professional Imperative: Educational Excellence for All

Volume Editor

David S. Martin

Dean, School of Education
Gallaudet University

American Association for Teacher Education
One Dupont Circle, Suite 610
Washington, D.C. 20036
(202) 293-2450

110

ISBN 0-8403-4654-9